

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Mayberry1964>

64
3

A CONSIDERATION OF THE MATERIAL
PECULIAR TO LUKE'S GOSPEL

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GENERAL FACULTY COUNCIL
COMMITTEE ON BACHELOR OF DIVINITY DEGREES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

BY
WILLIAM JOHN MAYBERRY, B.A.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

JUNE, ~~1963~~
1964

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
ST. STEPHEN'S THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that we have read and recommend to the School of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled A CONSIDERATION OF THE MATERIAL PECULIAR TO LUKE'S GOSPEL, submitted by William John Mayberry, B.A., in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
PREFACE	
I SOURCES OF LUKE'S GOSPEL	
1. The Unity and Common Authorship of Luke-Acts	1
2. The Question of Authorship	5
3. Date for the Writing of Luke-Acts	6
4. Why the Written Gospel?	8
5. How the New Testament Canon Came To Be	9
6. The History of Source Criticism	11
7. The Method of Literary Source Criticism	16
8. The Synoptic Problem and Some of Its Solutions	17
9. The Material Peculiar to Luke's Gospel	24
10. How Luke May Have Put His Sources Together	26
II RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL BACKGROUND	
1. Some Important Religious Doctrines	29
2. The Torah and The Temple	34
3. The Four Major Sects	36
4. The Political Situation	40
5. The Religious Answers to the Political Problem	41
6. Jesus' Response	42
7. The Conflict in the Early Church	45
8. Persecution	50

Chapter	Page
III THE REPHASING OF THE MATERIAL PECULIAR TO LUKE'S GOSPEL	53
1. The Significant Placement of the Nazareth Incident	57
2. Special Motifs:	60
(a) The Universal Note	
(b) The Holy Spirit	
(c) The Poor	
(d) The Outcaste and Sinner	
(e) The Women	
CONCLUSION	93
BIBLIOGRAPHY	

PREFACE

Frederick C. Grant once wrote, "--- most persons study the Gospels with one sole purpose in view: for further light upon the life and teaching of the One who was himself the Light of the World."¹ This was my original purpose in selecting the material peculiar to Luke's Gospel. It was an attempt to acquaint myself with the author at the point where he would most reveal his purpose and personality, precisely in material that was strictly his own. Of course this is not the only point at which Luke reveals himself. The way he alters Mark's Gospel or Q is also indicative of his personality and purpose.

Quite arbitrarily I limited my study to the material peculiar to Luke's Gospel. Probably if a person could get close to Luke where he is most himself, then he would be as close as possible to the man about whom Luke wrote, Jesus.

Luke was the only author to record the parables of the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, the Publican and the Pharisee. Obviously this was a man who had captured, what seemed to me, the very heart of the Gospel. The impact that Jesus made upon this man was evident in his writing and in the selection of his material.

You can imagine my great disappointment to find that scholars do not believe that Luke composed this peculiar material. He simply compiled it and edited it which meant that

¹ F. C. Grant, The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth, Harper and Brothers 1957. Page 8

this material was not Luke's after all. In fact there are many scholars who hold that Luke's own material was in written form before he even saw it, possibly in Aramaic. He merely fitted it in as best he could.

Coupled with this disappointment was the gnawing question: why did the other evangelists fail to record the parables of the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son etc.? Surely if nothing else was remembered, these would have been. What was at work here? Was it the sources that limited Mark and Matthew and John, and these parables were not in these sources; or was it their own purpose which governed their selection and they chose not to include them; or was the material passed on (both in oral and written form) the product of the church community, for the church community, and that the need of the church altered so that at one point they were not used but later on they were?

As more questions began piling up I could see where much profitable time could be spent on the problem of source material, which might help me to extract L. However, I could see that the goal of coming to know better the man, Jesus, would be steadily receding in the face of the profusion of books and articles on the Synoptic Problem, Q, Dispensing with Q, Proto-Luke Hypothesis, etc., as well as the recent developments in Form Criticism and Form History.

At this point I began to feel that Luke, of all the Gospel writers, was the one who captured the gracious humanity of Jesus, the man who came to seek and to save the lost, the friend

of the poor, companion of the sinner, the rouser of the religiously complacent, ostentatious and proud. Here began my interest in the Social Gospel. It seemed that this social emphasis was a direct implication of the Gospel of Luke, especially of the material peculiar to him.

I am not a scholar in the New Testament field; I have no knowledge of Greek, but I wish for my own pastorate as much as for a B. D. Thesis, to compile a short work that will indicate the direction of a man's life if he desired to follow Christ in today's world.

I gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness to the many honest men whose works I have used. Especially to H. J. Cadbury for suggesting to me the basic plan for my thesis. In his book entitled, The Making of Luke-Acts, there is a chapter called, 'Factors in Composition',² where he sets out four probabilities. Firstly, "In all composition much depends on the accessible material." And so I have begun with a brief survey of the source problem, and since the sources behind the third Gospel are related to sources in Mark and Matthew, I decided to broaden the chapter to include the Synoptic Problem. This is a brief historical survey and some up-to-date solutions.

Secondly, "A second factor that determines the ultimate character of a book consists of the conventional media of thought and expression." This suggested to me that a brief survey of the religious and political conditions of the first century

² H. J. Cadbury; The Making of Luke-Acts, MacMillan, 1927
page 12 - 17.

might have an important bearing when we come to the implications of the theology of L.

Thirdly, "A third factor in literary composition is the author's individuality." This will be the examination of the theology of L.

Fourthly, "Finally among the factors in authorship there is the author's conscious purpose." Here the purpose, plan, and objective of L will be examined and will lead to my conclusions.

CHAPTER I

SOURCES OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

The twenty-seven books of the New Testament have received wide publication and distribution in recent years primarily due to their many new translations such as The New English Bible, Revised Standard Version, Phillips, Moffatt, Weymouth and others. Many homes on the Pastorate I serve have these new translations, which does not, of course, imply that they are necessarily read any more than their dusty King James Version was. However, even the persons who faithfully and daily turn to their Bible may not appreciate that, "The principal contributor of this noteworthy collection is, as probably few people realize, not one of the more familiar names, but the author of Luke-Acts. These two volumes together occupy more than one quarter of the New Testament."¹

1. The Common Authorship and Unity of Luke-Acts

The author of Luke-Acts, for the sheer extent of his writings, is a very important writer. The reason most people would fail to connect the authorship of Luke with that of Acts is simply that they are separated by John's Gospel. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John tell the story of Jesus' life while Acts tells the story of the growth of the Church. The division is

¹ H. J. Cadbury; The Making of Luke-Acts, MacMillan, 1927, page 1

topical and altogether expected. However, the common authorship of Luke and Acts is "universally recognized by present day scholars."² "Among all the problems of New Testament authorship no answer is so universally agreed upon as is the common authorship of these two volumes. Each is addressed in its opening words to the same Theophilus, the second volume refers explicitly to the first, and in innumerable points of style the Greek diction of each shows close identity with the other. Whatever their difference in subject matter and sources, each volume is in its present form the work of the same ultimate editor. If anything can be proved by linguistic evidence, this fact is proved by it. The evidence has long been known and accepted."³ "The earliest direct references to the books in Christian literature assert their common authorship. Irenaeus in 'Against Heresies' written about A.D. 185, ascribed both books to Luke..⁴"

Not only is it important to recognize our indebtedness to the author of Luke-Acts, (for he tells us much about Jesus that is invaluable in the gospel, and the story of the early church is found no where else in the New Testament) but it is equally important to recognize that these are not two separate books but rather that they are part of a continuous work, since the Gospel gives the account of the event of Jesus Christ, while the Acts gives the account of the spread of the gospel from its Palestinian home to the cities of the Mediterranean and its culmination in the capital of the empire, Rome. F. C. Burkitt

² Interpreter's Bible, Abingdon, 1954, Volume 8, page 3

³ H. J. Cadbury; The Making of Luke-Acts, MacMillan, 1927, page 8

⁴ Interpreter's Bible, Abingdon, 1954, Volume 8, page 3

even goes so far as to suggest that the original plan of the author included three volumes. "The third volume is not extant; in fact, there is very little reason to suppose that it was ever actually written, but the absence of an adequate peroration at the end of the Acts of the Apostles (which forms the second volume of the series), shows us that further installment must have been contemplated."⁵

Most scholars prefer to have Luke-Acts represent the complete work intended by the author. His purpose, generally speaking, seems to be to tell the story of the rise and expansion of Christianity. He begins his story in Jerusalem with the prediction to Zechariah of the birth of a son. The ministry of Jesus takes place in Galilee where His countrymen reject him. The story then moves to Samaria and the Samaritans reject the gospel. The gospel ends at Jerusalem and the gift of God is absolutely rejected through crucifixion. Jerusalem seems to be the goal towards which all else moves. The risen Christ appears to the disciples in Jerusalem and they are told to wait in that city for the gift of power, the Holy Spirit. Acts opens with the disciples waiting in Jerusalem to receive the Holy Spirit. Christianity was first preached in Jerusalem and then as each chapter unfolds the Gospel spreads to the whole world, even to the seat of the empire, Rome, where Acts ends.

This expansion was foretold right at the beginning of the story when the author extended the quotation from Isaiah far enough to include the words, "All flesh shall see the salvation

⁵ F. C. Burkitt; The Gospel History and Its Transmission, T and T Clark, 1906, page 105

of God." He has Simeon the devout man who was looking for the salvation of Israel, say to Joseph and Mary - "My eyes have seen thy salvation... a light for revelation to the Gentiles." And so as his preface declares, it is his intention to relate the story of the rise and expansion of Christianity to the world. It is natural for this story to end at Rome, the capital of the world.

It can be observed at this point that although the author's intention is to record history ... "the things which have been accomplished among us"... this is often subordinated to more practical concerns. For instance, "Luke wished to show that Christianity was not a subversive sect Luke wished to support the claim that the Church had superseded the Synagogue as the true Israel and was entitled to the recognition and protection that the state had heretofore afforded Judaism Luke was eager to stress the fact that Christianity was a world religion that recognized no racial limitations"⁶

While having these major interests the author gives prominence, in contrast to the other Gospels, to the work of the Spirit, the importance of women, sympathy for the poor, importance of prayer, and so on. We will expect to take these general emphases of Luke-Acts into account when the special material is examined.

Now, we have suggested that the author of Luke-Acts was the same man and that he wrote at least these two books which we have in the New Testament and which are actually one continuous work. Who this author was is not so readily agreed upon

⁶ Interpreter's Bible, Abingdon, 1954, Volume 8, pages 6 and 7

by the scholars.

2. The Question of Authorship

The common view, early supported by tradition, is that, Luke the physician, mentioned in Colossians 4:14, Philemon 1:24, Timothy 4:11, the only companion of Paul who remained with him to the end, is the author of Luke-Acts. However, Grant in his book, The Growth of the Gospels, says that, "the data are too scanty for a precise solution of the problem."⁷ I do not feel responsible for marshalling all the evidence and drawing a conclusion on this problem.

H. J. Cadbury in The Making of Luke-Acts translates from the Canon of Muratori, usually dated around A.D. 175, as follows: "The third book of the Gospel, according to Luke, Luke that Physician, who after the ascension of Christ, when Paul had taken him with him as companion of his journey, composed in his own name on the basis of report. However, he did not himself see the Lord in the flesh and therefore as he could "trace the course of events" he set them down. So also he began his story with the birth of John.

But the Acts of all the apostles were written in one volume. Luke compiled for "most excellent Theophilus" what things were done in detail in his presence, as he plainly shows by omitting both the death of Peter and also the departure of Paul from the city, when he departed for Spain."⁸

⁷F. C. Grant; The Growth of the Gospels, Abingdon, 1933, page 168

⁸H. J. Cadbury; The Making of Luke-Acts, MacMillan, 1927, page 354

If tradition is true then Luke the physician seems certain to have written both volumes. J. M. Creed puts it this way "there is a very general agreement among scholars that the tradition either speaks truth or else is founded on truth. If the Lucan authorship of the existing work is called in question, it is generally held that the existing work incorporates some original writing by Luke."⁹

Vincent Taylor in an excellent, brief introduction to the gospels by the same title, sets out the problem of authorship in this way, "The main issues are (1) whether the 'We-sections' (footnote - that is, the sections in the Acts which are written in the first person plural, Acts 16:10-17, 20:5-15, 21:1-18, 27:1 - 28:16) in the Acts are written by the author of the entire work, and (2) whether the author can have been a companion of Paul having a personal knowledge of the Pauline Churches and of the problems of primitive Christianity."¹⁰

He answers both questions in the affirmative as do the majority of scholars, although the question of authorship is by no means a closed subject.

3. The Date for the Writing of Luke-Acts

The question of date of writing is also indefinite. Vincent Taylor says, "The date of the Gospel depends on the fact that Luke has used Mark, on the probability that the Fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) is implied in the form of Luke 21:20 "But when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies", and

⁹J. M. Creed; The Gospel According to St. Luke, MacMillan, 1930 page 14

¹⁰Vincent Taylor; The Gospels, Epworth, 1930, page 72

upon the belief that no great interval can separate the publication of Matthew and Luke on the whole there is most to be said for the period A.D. 80-85."¹¹

There are, of course, some scholars of unquestioned integrity who would disagree with Vincent Taylor quite markedly. For instance, Harnack wished to date the Gospel during Paul's lifetime¹² and Loisy, who thought the work of Luke-Acts had been revised by a later editor, dates this redactor in the second century.¹³ Burkitt, who thinks Luke and Acts contain details drawn directly from the 'Jewish Antiquities' of Josephus, a work published in A.D. 93 or 94 dates them between A.D. 95 and 105.¹⁴

The most convincing argument is from the Interpreter's Bible. "A date for Luke-Acts in the eighties or nineties of the first century would also account for the evident concern of the author to emphasize the favorable attitude that the state had adopted towards the church in the persons of its founder and its greatest missionary. Both the Gospel and the book of Acts were written at a time when Christians were suspected of covert disloyalty and were being regarded with a measure of hostility by imperial officials. Both volumes make a plea for state toleration of the new religion on the ground that the history of the church had been devoid of political offense.

¹¹Vincent Taylor; The Gospels, Epworth 1930, page 73

¹²Vincent Taylor; The Gospels, Epworth 1930, page 73

¹³F. C. Grant; The Growth of the Gospels, Abingdon 1933, page 168

¹⁴F.C.Burkitt; The Gospel History and Its Transmission, T. and T. Clark 1906, page 105-106

The little we know of the relationships between church and state during the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81-96) suggests that the stresses of this period could have occasioned the writing of Luke-Acts."¹⁵

Luke and Acts were compiled by the same author, probably Luke the physician referred to in Colossians 4:14, Philemon 1:24, Timothy 4:11 between A.D. 80-90 and were intended to be part of a continuous work.

4. Why the Written Gospel?

Since my interest is in Luke's special material as found in the Gospel, it is to be expected that this discussion be now limited to the Gospel. These are the most valuable parts of the literary treasure of the Christian Church as they record the life, teachings, death, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. They were not written by eyewitnesses since ".... in the primitive Christian communities, oral testimony was more highly valued: men preferred the 'living and abiding voice'.... the hope of Christ's speedy return dominated men's minds. Any day He might come upon the clouds of heaven with power and great glory: what need, then, was there for a book?"¹⁶

Besides the fact that there was no need for such books as our Gospels in the very early church, the type of preaching also discouraged their appearance. We take Peter's sermons in Acts and Paul's letters to be representative of the earliest Christian preaching. Almost at once we sense the lack of

¹⁵Interpreter's Bible; Volume 8, Abingdon 1954, page 9

¹⁶Vincent Taylor; The Gospels, Epworth, 1956, page 8

details about the life of Jesus and the teaching He gave on various occasions.¹⁷ "In more than one sense Paul could say that he knew Christ no longer after the flesh and 'the gospel which was preached by me is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man nor was I taught it.' The gospel preached by Paul was not a collection of anecdotes and maxims like our gospels Such simple records as we have in the gospels are unexpected, Some would even regard the existence of these books a greater miracle than anything they record."¹⁸

The reasons why the Gospels were finally set down are easily outlined. The eyewitnesses were dying out and the Coming was delayed. Then, too, as the mission to the Gentiles expanded it was necessary to say what Jesus had said and done. These sayings and stories were no doubt, at first, passed on orally to congregations, and church membership classes, as well as being used to defend the faith. The ones engaged in these pursuits would no doubt be looking for new stories and sayings, and after all, their memories were not much superior to the very best today so their effectiveness would be increased by jotting down these sayings and teachings and biographical notes, thereby enabling them to handle a great deal more material.

5. How the New Testament Canon Came To Be.

There are four Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, as there should be. For 'as early as the last quarter of the 2nd century Irenaeus justifies the church's fourfold gospel

¹⁷See Acts Chapter 2

¹⁸H. J. Cadbury; The Making of Luke-Acts, MacMillan 1927, page 26-29

in these words: "It is impossible that the gospels should be either more or fewer in number than they are. For since there are four regions of the world in which we live, and four principal winds, and the church is a seed sown in the whole earth, and the gospel is the pillar and ground of the church, and the breath of life, it is natural that it should have four pillars, from all quarters breathing incorruption and kindling men into life. Wherefore it is evident that the artificer of all things, the Word, who sitteth upon the Cherubim, and keepeth all together, when he was made manifest unto men, gave us his gospel in four forms, held together by one Spirit."¹⁹

Irenaeus notwithstanding, we know there were other gospels competing for recognition in the early church, one that most recently came to light is the Gospel of St. Thomas, and it is more accurate historically to say that the ones we have were the ones most utilized and revered by the early church.

Fortunately we have within the New Testament a direct reference to Paul's letters which are being appealed to as an authority. At II Peter 3:15-16 we read, "Meanwhile, consider that God's patience is meant to be man's salvation, as our dear brother Paul pointed out in his letter to you written out of the wisdom God gave him. In that letter, as indeed in all his letters, he referred to these matters." (J. B. Phillips)

But it was the heretic Marcion of the second century who was the first Christian to suggest a New Testament canon

¹⁹R. H. Lightfoot; History and Interpretation of the Gospels, Hodder & Stoughton, 1935, page 1

of scripture. On the basis of his study of the Gospel he believed Jesus to have revealed the Divine Will to men. The God Jesus preached was good and kind and to Marcion, without the benefit of modern scholars who see the development of progressive revelation, this God was entirely different to the God of the Old Testament. So he discarded the Old Testament and became the first to collect Christian writings and treat them as scripture. In his day the Old Testament was referred to, and doctrines were proved from it, but no book in the New Testament was thought of as Scripture. Although, as noted, they were referred to as in II Peter. The books were not new, they were used and venerated before, but they did not occupy the same rank as the Old Law. And so provoked into a defence of the faith by Marcion, the early church set about forming its own canon of scripture.

6. The History of Source Criticism

Once the Gospels were written and canonized they were regarded as complete, both in history and doctrine. "Preferences might exist for one rather than another; thus St. Matthew's Gospel has generally been the most and St. Mark's Gospel the least esteemed; but strictly they have been the fourfold book, of which each part is essential to the whole. They were also believed to be free from any substantial inconsistency. The divergencies were thought to be only apparent, and to involve questions of order. An order of events was sought - which would allow the substance of all four gospels to be incorporated in a single account without

sacrificing the peculiar features of any portion and without changing the sequence of any gospel. The question was not whether such an arrangement was possible, but only what it actually was. The task of the student could only be to harmonize."²⁰ Perhaps the earliest, certainly the most famous such Harmony, was Tatian's Diatessaron where the four gospels are used to support a harmonious life of Jesus. And this kind of thinking is in the minds of many people today, even though it may be dormant. They assume that if there should be any differences between the gospels this is only because all eye-witnesses differ in the details of reporting any event. Each writer, apparently, was completely independent of the others. But there is no difference about the fact that the event occurred. That, apparently, takes care of history and as far as doctrine is concerned the gospels were inspired. That is, they are the inspired Word of God which means that God inflooded the author's mind and he wrote as if he were taking dictation.

Such sincere people may be the salt of the earth but they are preserving something which is contrary to the revelation they want to defend. God came to this earth as a man, the son of a Jewish carpenter. This point is often skipped over. In its place is the emphasis on the Risen Christ and the individual's private salvation out of the world of sin. What the gospels record is God in flesh in the world. The human element in the remembering, repeating, writing, collecting, editing process of

²⁰R. H. Lightfoot; History and Interpretation, Hodder & Stoughton, 1935, page 2

the Gospel material, is therefore of first importance. To be sure, they are only witnesses to the act of God for human salvation, nevertheless, they, their methods, purposes, plans, characters, personalities, cultural limitations, are important. "As the Incarnate came in flesh, so the story of the Life is told in human fashion; and as through the flesh we see God, so through the human writings we hear the Divine."²¹

Axiomatic as our acceptance of the study of sources is today in the field of scholarship, this former view prevailed from the second century to the eighteenth century. If scholars had seen the implication of the Protestant Reformation they would have realized sooner that a change was needed. Luther "transformed faith from the mere acceptance of ecclesiastical dogma into a personal living trust in God through Jesus Christ. This transformation necessarily involved a change of method in dealing with scripture ..."²²

Luther himself, however, hindered this change by his use of scripture as a dossier of proof-texts for new doctrinal constructions, so that it has been said that the Reformation merely substituted an infallible Bible for an infallible church. As we can see this is no deliverance at all "only instead of being the intention to believe what the Church believes, it would become the intention to believe what the scholars think."²³

²¹Vincent Taylor; The Gospels, Epworth 1956, 8th Edition, page 11

²²T. W. Manson; The Teachings of Jesus, Cambridge 1935, 2nd Edition, page 3

²³T. W. Manson; The Teachings of Jesus, Cambridge 1935, 2nd Edition, page 3

However, towards the end of the eighteenth century, in the deist controversy, the right of scripture to say something on its own account was proclaimed. From then on the Bible was no longer used to support doctrines in Theology but rather the aim of Theology was to set down doctrines taught in scripture. Manson points out that, "A parallel development took place in the study of the life of Jesus. From the earliest times to the end of the eighteenth century, such Lives of Jesus as were written were composed not as historical works but as treatises for edification. So long as the essential truth concerning the Lord was given by doctrinal formulae, the Gospel narratives could only serve to embellish the figure provided by the formulae.. Hitherto the portrait of the Master had been painted to fit into the frame provided ready-made by the creeds and confessions: now it began to appear that the proper procedure is to paint the portrait first and then make a frame to fit it."²⁴

It may be natural for Manson to observe this point from a theological perspective, but it can be seen to be in the air. "Toland, one of the earlier exponents of the deistic position, and a sincere defender of the gospels, wrote the following passage in 1696 'All men will own the verity I defend if they read the sacred writings with that equity and attention that is due to mere humane works, nor is there any different rule to be followed in the interpretation of scripture from what is common to all other books. Whatever unprejudiced person shall use these means, will find them notorious deceivers, who maintain the New Testament is written without any order or certain scope, but

²⁴T. W. Manson; The Teachings of Jesus, Cambridge, 1935
2nd Edition, page 4-5

just as matters came into the apostles' heads."²⁵

These events were the first stirrings of a more inquiring mind as a result of the Reformation faith. Men began to read these Gospels as if they were like any other book. "The new attitude is well expressed in the title of Lessing's small book on the Gospels, which may be regarded as the fountain source of modern Gospel criticism: A New Hypothesis concerning the Evangelists, considered as purely Human Writers of History."²⁶ When this approach was followed differences were noted so that in 1707 Mill's, Greek New Testament included thirty thousand variants of the text.

St. Augustine's solution for such problems were, "that whenever we find the evangelists inconsistent, in their accounts of anything said or done by our Lord, we are not to suppose them speaking of the same thing, but of some other, very like to it, said or done at a different time. For it is sacreligious vanity, he (Augustine) says, to calumniate the Gospels, rather than believe the same thing to have been twice performed, when no man can prove that it could not really be so: and when this rule fails, his next direction is, to take up with any solution, rather than allow it as a consequence, that any of the evangelists had been guilty of an untruth or a mistake."²⁷ This type of solution shows simply the limitations of the age in which it was produced.

²⁵ R. H. Lightfoot; History and Interpretation in the Gospels
Hodder and Stoughton, 1935. Page 3

²⁶ J. M. Creed; The Gospel According to St. Luke, MacMillan 1930,
Page XIV

²⁷ R. H. Lightfoot: History and Interpretation in the Gospels,
Hodder and Stoughton, 1935, Page 5

7. The Method of Literary Source Criticism

In the middle of the eighteenth century, as the problem of the literary relationship of the gospels received increased interest, Carl Lachmann, in 1835, offered a solution that has remained the first step in its unravelling: the priority of the Gospel of Mark. This was received as quite a blow since most scholars adhered to St. Augustine's view that Mark was an abbreviation of Matthew and it was some time before Lachmann's thesis was read. But as Lightfoot correctly observed...."time was on the side of Lachmann."²⁸ This important solution must not, however, take precedence over Lachmann's approach to the problem for he was the first man to make a literary comparison of the Gospels, and while this enabled him to establish the priority of Mark, this method has enabled subsequent scholars to do much else.

Any study of the Gospels recognizes that the first three Gospels are different in point of view and arrangement from the Fourth Gospel, which has a different concept of Jesus and tells in many respects a different history. It is more an interpretation of the person and work of Jesus rather than a record of his words and deeds, and it is therefore consistently studied separately from the other Gospels. It is interesting to note at this point that there is a weighty movement afoot today to consider all four Gospels together. Although a literary examination of the three Gospels is essential apart from John, still in considering

²⁸ R. H. Lightfoot; History and Interpretation in the Gospels. Hodder and Stoughton, 1935, Page 8.

the theology of the Gospels it is important to take a four-fold approach. I will be obliged to relate Luke's special material to the other three Gospels as well as to the whole of the New Testament.

The first three Gospels are called the Synoptic Gospels because, "they are all constructed on a common plan, and from first to last, amid minor differences, the teaching and work of Jesus are presented from the same general point of view."²⁹ "The use of the word Synoptic as applied to the first three Gospels is due to J.J. Griesbach ... In 1774 he published the first part of a new edition of the Historical Books of the New Testament, containing a synopsis of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke."³⁰

The method was to set the common parts beside each other so that one might serve to make the rest intelligible. This method is still recommended for advanced students of the New Testament.³¹ I used this method to confirm the abstraction of Luke's special material as outlined by Streeter and Creed. Now that we have examined the history of, and established the method of Literary Source Criticism we can outline the Synoptic Problem and some of its solutions.

8. The Synoptic Problem and Some of its Solutions

The problem is the question of the relationship that exists between the first three Gospels. T. W. Manson outlines the generally admitted gains of the study of this problem as follows:

²⁹ J. E. Carpenter, The First Three Gospels, British and Foreign Unitarian Assoc., 1909, 4th Edition, page 7.

³⁰ C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, MacMillan, 1927, page 11.

³¹ See F. C. Grant, The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth 1957, page 41-47.

"a) Mark is prior to both Matthew and Luke: and the two latter have borrowed freely from Mark. Between them they reproduce the whole of Mark with the exception of some thirty-one verses. Nine-tenths of Mark is transcribed in Matthew and rather more than half of Mark in Luke. The position is thus that "Matthew may be regarded as an enlarged edition of Mark; Luke is an independent work incorporating considerable portions of Mark." (Streeter: The Four Gospels. page 151)

b) Where Matthew and Luke have matter in common which does not appear in Mark (about two hundred verses), they are both dependent on a source now lost (usually referred to as Q).____ (Which Lightfoot reminds us did not come from the German Quelle meaning source as is commonly supposed but from Dr. A. Robinson who was in the habit of referring to Mark as P (reminiscences of St. Peter) and to the next document, the sayings document, by the next letter in the alphabet, namely Q.)

c) The subtraction of Marcan and Q material from Matthew leaves a residue of matter peculiar to that Gospel, and the same is the case with Luke. The analysis of the three Gospels thus leads to the differentiation of the four main sources of information designated by the symbols, Mk, Q, M, and L. Mk is our second Gospel: Q is the lost document which lies behind the matter common to Matthew and Luke, and M and L stand for the sources of matter peculiar to Matthew and Luke respectivelyCanon Streeter suggests the connection of Mk with Rome, Q with Antioch, M with Jerusalem and L with Caesarea. One of our Gospels--Mark-- corresponds with the document Mk, but the

other two are composite works, Matthew being built up out of the elements MK + Q + M, and Luke out of Q + L + MK."³²

The aim of this chapter was to set out the sources of Luke's Gospel: We began with a discussion of the composite work Luke-Acts and then, perhaps awkwardly, we traced the approach to the Gospels to the eighteenth century where the Synoptic Problem was stated and the results affirmed.

A few words must be said about how these components, Q, L and MK are thought to have been put together to form Luke's Gospel. The first question may well be, 'Were the sources Q and MK written or oral? Most scholars believe they were written. 'Only so can we explain the astonishing verbal agreement between Matthew, Mark and Luke, in many parallel passages, and the less striking but even more significant agreement often present in the order in which events and sayings are recorded....The commonly suggested Two Document Hypothesis suggests that Matthew and Luke used two main sources---the Gospel of Mark, and a document containing the sayings of Jesus (Q)."³³ Streeter, Lightfoot, Manson and Creed, to mention only a few scholars, agree with this statement of Taylor's.

The second question may well be, in what order were they fitted together to form Luke's Gospel? At this point we enter the area of the famous Proto-Luke Hypothesis put forward by Streeter. He observed that in five important places, namely

³² T. W. Manson; The Teachings of Jesus, Cambridge 2nd edition, 1935, Page 7 and 8.

³³ Vincent Taylor; The Gospels, Epworth 8th edition 1956 Page 8 and 9.

3:1-4:30, 6:20-8:3, 9:51-18:14, 19:1-27 and 22:47-24:53.

Luke deserted Mark preferring to use Q and L. However, if the gospel begins with non-marcian material (Chapters 1 and 2) and ends with non-marcian material and at important points inbetween deserts Mark does this not suggest that instead of Mark being the framework, non-marcian material formed the framework. Into this framework, most of Mark was inserted in blocks of material. Streeter goes on to demonstrate that the editor of Luke's Gospel found Q and L (not including chapters 1 and 2) in a document which became his primary authority and then later he found Mark, which he also highly valued, but when QL and MK contained alternative versions of the same incident or saying, he usually preferred that of QL. This document Streeter calls "Proto-Luke" and in his book The Four Gospels he further establishes the Four Document Hypothesis which says that actually all the sources were written, as we noted above. For Streeter, L was original notes made by Luke in Caesarea which he expanded into a complete Gospel with the help of a copy of Q. This lacked almost the whole Galilean ministry and so Luke fitted MK into Proto-Luke(QL) when it came upon the scene, to form Luke's Gospel as we now have it.

Taylor developed this theory with some modification especially at the point of L. "There is very much less to be said for presuming the existence of a documentary source, L.

On the whole, it seems best to use this sign as a convenient symbol for the oral tradition of Caesarea."³⁴

Since Proto-Luke is but an hypothesis it is natural that some subsequent scholars disagree with Streeter and Taylor. Loisy, for example, prefers to hold that Luke is dependent upon Matthew and so there is no need to establish the document Q since Luke had read Matthew. This seems a questionable hypothesis. Luke was involved in telling the story of the expansion of the Christian Church. If he had read Matthew why did he choose not to mention the fact that Jesus established his church upon Peter. This would have been awkward to resolve since he was the companion of Paul who actually established the many churches and there is no suggestion of this awkwardness in the Gospel or Acts. Whatever the reasons, this disagreement is contrary to the main stream of thinking in the secondary sources that I am dependent upon.

Luke made notes and gathered material while in Caesarea and combined these with a document of the sayings of Jesus called Q. This forms the so called Proto-Luke. It was a complete gospel. Later on Luke came across a copy of MK and he fitted large extracts of this new material into the framework of QL. Even later he came across material (Luke chapters 1 and 2) which formed the Birth and Early Childhood of Jesus and which he used to preface his QL and MK.

³⁴ Vincent Taylor; The Gospels, Epworth, 1956, 8th Edition, page 9.

Since my aim is to extract and examine the material L, it may be important to discuss whether or not scholars think this material was in documentary form. Streeter of course thinks it was. Taylor, whose work accepts the Proto-Luke hypothesis thinks that the material L was in oral form. S. M. Gilmour in the introduction to Luke's Gospel in the Interpreter's Bible says, "If the non-markan matter is abstracted from Luke, it will be seen to have even less homogeneity than its Q content by itself and even less claim to have constituted the main body of a gospel....In the course of composing his gospel volume, Luke used in addition to MK and Q a number of cognate literary sources that can loosely be called L."³⁵ Gilmour concludes his survey of Proto-Luke by saying that the Proto-Luke hypothesis as the framework of the Gospel can be dismissed and he further suggests that it is imaginary.

In 1933, F. C. Grant in his book The Growth of the Gospels surveys the work of B. H. Streeter, B. S. Easton, and H. J. Cadbury and outlines three great contributions they have made to New Testament study. The first is relevant here. "The hypothesis is advanced that the bulk of Luke's special matter, usually designated L, came from a really existent document or written source or collection of material. Easton and Streeter are absolutely sure of this, Cadbury is more hesitant....No one has done more than Easton, in the English speaking world,

³⁵ Interpreter's Bible, Abingdon, 1954, Volume 8, pages 16 and 17.

to prove the independence and homogeneity of the source, characterized to a certain degree by a special vocabulary of its own, and clearly reflecting a definite circle of ideas and beliefs, and hopes. It would be interesting to prove, if possible, that all of Luke's special material came from one single document, parallel to and on a par with MK; but there are difficulties, not yet overcome, and perhaps never to be overcome, in the way; Chiefly the apparent integrity of the Lucan Infancy Narratives, on the one hand, and also that of his Passion Narrative--used very differently in combination with Mark--on the other; likewise the form and apparent integrity of the main body of his second teaching source, ordinarily designated by L. The source L is perhaps, then, only one of (at least) three sources peculiar to Luke; not a gospel; but another sayings source. But at least the certainty of the existence of a definite homogeneous written source--what ever its exact limits--is now, we may say, practically established."³⁶

At this point I confess a certain hesitancy in accepting any such view of the form of L as being the established and assured results of criticism. I am reminded of Professor Cadbury's devastating destruction of the popular hypothesis that Luke had been a physician who used medical language, by showing that the satirist Lucian had used language equally medical. Hobart had published a book in 1882 entitled, The Medical Language of St. Luke, which was subsequently

³⁶ F. G. Grant; The Growth of the Gospels, Abingdon, 1933, Page 158 and 159.

endorsed by the great Harnack in 1906 so that for a long time this hypothesis was looked upon as one of the assured results of criticism. Cadbury dissolved this hypothesis. And so although I hold with the thinking that Luke's special material contains two separate strands of matter--Chapters 1 and 2, and the teaching source and Passion and Resurrection stories, I do not claim for this undeniable proof, but certainly recognize that I am dealing in probabilities.

However, this may be taken as a rough outline of the documentary theory of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels and the literary sources of Luke's Gospel.

9. The Material Peculiar to Luke's Gospel

Luke's special material that will be considered in this thesis has been derived from B. H. Streeter's The Four Gospels page 198 and from J. M. Creed's The Gospel According to Luke pages LXVI - LXVII.

Chapter 1 and 2.

3:1-2, 5-6, 10-14, 23-38.

4:13-30.

5:1-11, 39.

6:24-26, 34.

7:3-6a, 11-17. 21, 29-30, 36-50.

8:1-3.

9:31-32, 43, 51-56, 61-62.

10:1, 16-20, 28-42.

11:1, 5-8, 12, 16, 27-28, 36-38, 40-41, 45, 53-54.

12:13-21, 32-33a, 35-38, 41, 47-50, 52, 54-57.

13:1-17, 22-23, 25-27, 31-33.

14:1-24, 28-33.

15:1-2, 7-32.

16:1-12, 14-15, 19-31.

17:7-22, 28-30, 32.

18:1-14, 34.

19:1-27, 39-44.

20:34-35a, 36b, 38b.

21:19-20, 22, 24, 26a, 28, 34-38.

22:15-18, 28-30a, 31-32, 35-38, 43-44, 48-49, 51, 53b, 61a, 68.

23:2, 4-18, 27-32. 34a. 36. 39-43, 46b, 48, 51a, 53b-54, 56b.

24:10-53.

At this point I only wish to say that on the basis of my reading it seems evident on linguistic grounds that chapters 1 and 2 were a written source that the author of the Gospel prefaced to his other sources. When he did this is a matter of pure conjecture. Professor C. C. Torrey in his book, The Translations Made From The Original Aramaic Gospels argues on linguistic grounds that chapters 1 and 2 must have been translated, not merely from a semitic language, but from Hebrew as distinct from Aramaic. Torrey is famous for the attempt to establish Aramaic sources for all the Gospels. However, at this point most scholars are inclined to agree with him, although it has been pointed out that chapters 1 and 2 are replete both with words and expressions characteristic

of Luke's style and also with reminiscences of the Septuagint. "These two observations, however, to some extent cover the same ground, one of the things by which Luke's style is distinguished from that of the other Gospels is his fondness for Septugintal language. Luke knew his Greek Bible very well, and may have thought a kind of "Biblical Greek" appropriate for a Gospel."³⁷ Streeter concludes his discussion by saying "Taken all in all, the probabilities point to a written source."³⁸

10. How Luke May Have Put His Sources Together

In conclusion, I shall make a brief attempt to imagine how Luke put his Gospel together. As a mission-field worker he would have the motivation to clothe his preaching with stories from the life of Jesus. The stories he would remember and those he would attempt to preserve in his notebook were no doubt selected for a variety of reasons, but mainly for two. Either because they answered a particular problem or need that was confronting him and those closely associated with him or because they fulfilled his own interests as a unique individual. The unseen, working Spirit of God was in both. It is as true to say, "I am a preacher and God is with me and the results are by His Grace," as it is to say, "I am a teacher and God is with me and the results are by His Grace," or "I am an office-worker, brick-layer" and so on. We are not alone in our interests. My point is that

³⁷ C. H. Streeter; The Four Gospels, MacMillian-4 Impression revised, 1930, Page 266 and 267.

³⁸ C. H. Streeter; The Four Gospels, MacMillian-4 Impression revised, 1930, Page 267.

Luke's opportunity to write a Gospel is not on a higher plane than writing the present history of the church. What sets it apart from all else is the fact that it is a reliable, next to eyewitness record of the Christ event. And I believe the Spirit of God was at work in Luke because Luke was concerned about and involved with, other people in trying to show Christ to be their saviour. And so he collected his stories. When Q came into his hands he expanded it with his previous material which made a gospel. Usually he kept his sources separate but often his interests would overflow and he would prefix to a Q section some phrase which beautifully portrays his special interest rather than being material from a particular source. For example 4:1(a) "And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan." is redundant since the rest of the verse taken from MK reads, "and was led in the Spirit in the wilderness during forty days being tempted of the devil." In Chapter III I will attempt to show that one of Luke's special interests is the Holy Spirit and here we see how this literally bubbles out of him in a creative fashion, rather than being, necessarily, found in his source. When MK came along Luke added it to his LQ in blocks of material which he seldom alters. Since Luke's Gospel is the most beautiful book ever written, according to Renan, we know that he possessed tremendous creative ability. Therefore his willingness to let MK stand on its own is looked upon as faithfulness to his sources rather than dull copying.

To L, Q and MK, Luke added the birth narratives. These were very likely in written form also as were MK and Q.

The next chapter will outline the cultural climate to which Jesus responded with his life and teachings and which were remembered, interpreted and transmitted orally by eyewitnesses and which were selected and interpreted and transmitted in written form by the evangelists who faced and wrote to a much different world.

CHAPTER II

RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL BACKGROUND

The first chapter was an attempt to outline the history of the documentary theory of the origin of the synoptic gospels as it is applied to Luke's Gospel, and to set out its sources, both oral and documentary. Before moving to an examination of Luke's special material it may prove helpful to first understand something of the first century background, out of which, and to which, and for which Jesus, and then Luke responded. For it can only be against this background that the New Testament can be correctly interpreted.

1. Some Important Religious Doctrines

Since Jesus was a Jew, knowledge of Judaism is essential. Perhaps the primary characteristic of Judaism was its religious view of history. To the Jews, God revealed His Nature through historical events, ie: their struggle to break out of Egypt, to found a nation in Canaan, their fight against disruption from within and destruction from mighty nations from without; the sad plight of the exiles in Babylonia; the attempt to establish an independent nation against overwhelming odds. "That this view was held is demonstrated by the fact that the story of this people was gathered together, edited, and shaped so as to present the story as religious history; this is what,

we have in the old Testament."¹

History, as the sphere in which God works out his purposes for Mankind is the overall climate of thought under which the Jewish religion developed. This concept was essential for the first Christians, for because of it, they would say that in the historical life, death, and resurrection of the man Jesus, God had been at work to redeem the world.

This concept enabled the Jews to arrive at many important doctrines. For example, their escape from bondage as slaves, and their establishment of a nation at Mount Sinai precipitated the belief that they were God's Chosen People, not for privilege, an idea into which this often degenerated, but for responsibility. They were chosen to share the knowledge of God's purposes with all nations, as the prophets so desperately tried to do. This was to be their destiny. They were to be world missionaries. So when they built their temple in Jerusalem it was natural to make the largest court the Court of the Gentiles through which all the nations of the world might come to God. This was their destiny. When Jesus drove the money changers from this court it was perhaps more because His own people had surrendered their divine calling than because they were literally defiling the House of God. A second example centres on their interpretation of their experience during the Exile. This experience led to the doctrine of

¹ Eric Lane Titus; Essentials of New Testament Studies, Ronald, 1958, pages 37 and 38.

Monotheism and the doctrine of Creation. Until this time the Jewish religion centred in Jerusalem, particularly in the temple. God was thought to be all powerful in Judea and Israel, but there were other gods of the surrounding peoples who were just as powerful in their own territory. Although the prophet Isaiah had taught prior to the Exile that there was one God and that He was over all, this was not part of the people's experience until they found themselves in Assyria, Babylonia and Persia, and found that their belief in God was preserved. God was there with them, even in suffering. Thus the exile reminded the Israelites that there was one God over all. If He was Lord over all He must have created all. Here arose the doctrine of Creation.

Thus we see that the Jews had a beginning of history, and a view of history which enabled them to know God's will. All that needed to be added was an end, or goal, or destiny of history. Their destiny as seen by the prophets was to spread their knowledge of God to all the world. Unfortunately, because of human limitations, this was overlooked, and in its place was the dream of reward and privilege that would befall the Jewish nation, and of punishment and vengeance that would befall her enemies. Throughout their history this dream was intensified by its constant frustration. They had been chosen as God's people through Abraham. They had been redeemed to freedom in the establishment of a nation under King David, only to run into centuries of being overrun and overruled.

Their sense of history as the medium through which God works out His purposes for mankind, at this time, found expression in the Messianic hope, the conviction that God would raise up a Messiah to bring the dream to fulfillment.

The concept of the Messiah took various forms, two of which are worth mentioning. The earliest messianic hope assumed the form of the return of the supposed glories of the Davidic Kingdom in which the son of David Messiah would lead them to victory over all their enemies and bring peace to their land. We will see how this religious concept was used in answer to the political scene during Jesus' lifetime by the Zealots.

In later Judaism, since this hope was constantly frustrated, and they remained a subject people, the idea developed that God Himself, through the agency of the heavenly Son-of-Man would bring in the new age by a cosmic cataclysm. This idea finds expression in the biblical Book of Daniel and the New Testament Gospels. "Jesus and the New Testament writers inherited this idea, heightened in intensity by a belief in the imminence of the cataclysm. This feature of New Testament thought is known as eschatology, being derived from the Greek word 'eschaton,' meaning 'end'."²

This is not to imply that eschatology is lacking in the Old Testament. The concern for the state of the individual after death, and for the course of human history when the present order of things had been brought to a close, slowly

² Eric Lane Titus; Essentials of New Testament Study, Ronald, 1958, page 38.

developed. The individual's soul after death had a shadowy existence in sheol, which is the region under the earth in contrast to heaven, where God is, which is the region above the earth. Although the idea of the resurrection of the body was not part of Old Testament scripture, the nation had a possibility of resurrection through a remnant. The course of human history was thought to be brought to a close by the Day of Judgment. It was first thought that on this day God would punish all the enemies of Israel. Later it came to be believed that God would punish the bad Jews as well. On this day the righteous Jews would receive God's political and social blessings, and the enemies of Israel and the unrighteous Jews would be punished.

When the Jews were taken into exile they came into contact with Babylonian myth-cycles, and their concepts changed somewhat. Sheol now becomes a place of punishment for evil spirits which was likely carried over into the New Testament as well. The Day of Judgment came to include two ages. The present age was the Kingdom of God. This was the Messianic program carried over into Christianity.

The New Testament idea of eschatology was a development from Judaism, modified by the fact of Jesus' resurrection. In Jesus' teachings the Kingdom of God is eschatological in the sense that it would come suddenly with His return and be ushered in by a general judgment. Jesus, however, does not elaborate on the idea of the Kingdom itself, but rather makes

it a point of contact with the Jews for His exposition of eternal life, ie; the life that characterizes the coming age, and may be begun in the present evil age. Eternal life characterizes membership in the Kingdom.

Eschatology was also a controlling element in the teaching of Paul. "Under its influence the Apostle held himself aloof from social reform and revolution. In his opinion Christians were living in the 'last days' of the present evil age. Soon Christ would appear and establish His judgment such that the wicked would be punished and the righteous share the joys of resurrection and the messianic Kingdom. While Paul's point of view is eschatological his fundamental thought is really the new life of the believer, through the Spirit, which is made possible by the acceptance of Jesus as the Christ."³

2. The Torah and The Temple

We have seen that of primary importance to the Jewish religion was their religious concept of history which led to the formulation of many doctrines. God was alive and active in history. This belief was gradually set down in writing when they began to record their history. Judaism then become a religion of a book. Of first importance was the Torah, or law, which comprised the first five books of our Old Testament. Next in importance was the group of books known as the Prophets. The third division was the Writings

³ Dictionary of the Bible, edited James Hastings, Scribners, 1909.

which had not been finalized at Jesus' time. They were finalized in 90 A. D. at the Council of Jamnia.

"In addition to the written law, there had grown in late Judaism a vast oral tradition whose purpose was to make the former relevant to the needs of changing conditions. In theory it was a liberalizing of the written Torah. In practice, however, it was often as binding as the written law. Difficulty arose when men construed the law with exact literalness; hence legalism resulted in formalism and externalism. At this point the law tended to become a barrier to spontaneous religious experience and insight."⁴

The religion of Judaism centred in the Temple at Jerusalem which was begun by Herod the Great in 20 B. C., and was still incomplete during Jesus' public ministry. As a building it was the pride of the nation, a magnificent sight. The centre of the building contained a sacred shrine separated from the high altar by a great curtain. Around this centre were the pens for the animals for sacrifice on the altar, and the Priest's court. Outside this was the court of the Jews, and beyond this was the court of the Gentiles - an important court, for when Israel was truest to its genius, all foreigners were to have access to Israel's God. In Jesus' day this court was given over to markets for worshippers wishing to buy sacrificed animals. We have noted how Jesus responded to this situation. The Temple also

⁴ Eric Lane Titus; Essentials in New Testament Study, Ronald, 1958, pages 39 and 40.

housed the Great Sanhedrin. It can be said that the Temple was the centre of Judaism for two reasons. The structure itself compelled the pride of Jewish nationalism. Inside, the daily services and the great feasts provided a unifying symbol for the religion.

In outlying areas where they had no temple, the means of the spiritual life came to the people through the synagogues, primarily in the form of religious instruction in the Law. The importance of the synagogue is indicated by the fact that when the Temple was destroyed in 70 A. D., the religion continued, organized about the synagogue and the Torah. Since Pharisaism was the religion of the synagogue, it continued, whereas the religion of the Sadducees died out. The synagogue and the Torah were close to the people and strongly influenced Jesus, whereas the Temple and ritual were remote.

3. The Four Major Sects.

"Judaism of the first century was a sectarian religion."⁵ The first major sect was the Pharisees or separatists. Their origin is difficult to trace. The concept of separatism probably began after the Exile in the days of Ezra who taught the Jews not to intermarry with the heathens. The idea was to form a community, exclusive and nationalistic, half state and half church. This was the state of endeavour when in the third century B. C. Hellenism began to threaten Judaism

⁵ Eric Lane Titus; Essentials of New Testament Study, Ronald, 1958, page 41.

with annihilation. The more zealous Jews drew apart calling themselves 'Holy Men' (Hasidim) These men came to be called Pharisees. They were the very heart of the nation who compromised with neither the Hellenists nor the Romans. They believed that God in His own good time - and that quite soon - would grant the nation its desire of extinction of the enemy, and rewards for the Jews. Meanwhile, they considered that the duty of a true Israelite was whole - hearted devotion to the Torah. As Hastings Dictionary points out, Pharisaism actually cleared the way for Christianity, by its liberalizing and spiritualizing tendencies, (the priesthood was a closed corporation, entrance only by birth) by its functions of teaching and preaching; (the priesthood exhausted itself by the ritual of the Temple) by its taking the Messianic idea and working it into the very texture of common consciousness; by its teaching of the resurrection. The Pharisees in the Gospels are most often portrayed as the enemies of Jesus. They are represented as thorough legalists who felt the observance of the external requirements of the Law was sufficient. The attitude of Jesus, as represented by the Gospels is one of condemnation for their superficiality and exclusiveness, "It is probable that the more objective evaluation of the Pharisees would recognize their possession of great strengths as well as weaknesses."⁶ For it is true that along with their good work went some lamentable defects

⁶ Eric Lane Titus; Essentials of New Testament Study, Ronald, 1958, page 41.

and limitations such as narrow nationalism, external legalism, and exclusive separateness.

The second major sect was the Sadducees. Like that of the Pharisees, their origin is obscure. Probably the name is derived from 'Zadok' whom Solomon installed as chief priest. About the year 200 B. C. when party lines were beginning to be drawn, the name was chosen to point out the party of the priests. That is not to say that no priest could be a Pharisee or a Scribe, nor to say that all priests were Sadducees. Generally they were members of the well-to-do aristocracy. Their beliefs were partly determined by this fact, for, in direction, they were conservative, and champions of the status - quo. They denied the oral tradition and the view on eschatology which embraced a belief in the resurrection from the dead, and the afterlife. From this background we can see why Jesus had almost no dealings with the Sadducees during His ministry. Jesus' interests were in the common people. Ultimately it was the Sadducees who forced His crucifixion..

The third major sect was the Essenes. They were a monastic ascetic order with seemingly foreign influence within nationalistic Judaism. In all probability they share a common origin with the Pharisees ie; in the Hasidim movement. They were a fellowship of celibate men primarily although the cemetery in Qumran where they colonized during the first century B. C. contained skeletons of women. This

might suggest that the fellowship also included families. Their intention was to live completely apart from the contamination of the world, and to purify their spiritual life by a strict adherence to the Torah. They engaged in baptism, participated in a daily sacred meal, and were strict Sabbatarians. Like the Christian group itself, the sect thought itself to be the true people of God. They also had a teacher of righteousness, identified by some as the servant of Isaiah 53; by others as the Messiah. The sect was an eschatological community in the sense that it believed that the present age of evil would give place to a new and good age.

The fourth major sect was the Zealots, an extremist party, formed by Judas of Gamala who headed the opposition to the census of Quirinius in 6 or 7 A.D. They wished to hasten by means of the sword, the fulfillment of the Messianic hopes of the Jewish people. They considered it an act of disloyalty to God to acknowledge Caesar as their King, and they refused to pay taxes to Rome. Although their rebellion of 6 A.D. was crushed, the movement continued, and found its most dramatic and tragic expression in the war of 66-70 A.D., resulting in the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 70 A.D. The movement was finally crushed in the war of 132-135 at Barcachba. It is to be recalled that among the disciples of Jesus there was at least one Zealot.

Jesus as a Jew can be known only in relation to the religious background of Judaism whose tenets and sectarian

character have just been outlined. It remains now to examine the political background of the first century.

4. The Political Situation

When Jesus was born, Herod the Great was the ruler of Palestine. His rule was cruel and efficient. Although he rebuilt the temple in Jerusalem, his main policy was to break down the barriers between Jew and non-Jew, and thus remove conditions that made the land so hard to govern.

When he died in 4 B.C. his kingdom was divided among his three sons. Galilee and Perea, where Jesus spent most of his life was assigned to Herod Antipas, who is simply called Herod in the Gospels. From the historian Josephus we learn that Herod was crafty and unscrupulous, well sustaining the epithet 'fox' that Jesus once gave him.⁷ One son, Archelaus, proved unable to keep his territory in order. In 6 A.D. he was removed and replaced by a procurator. In 26 A.D. Pontius Pilate was appointed to this position, one which he held for ten years, including the period of Jesus' public life. The rulers of Palestine found it wise to grant the actual governing of the Jews pretty much to the Jews themselves. The Jews handled the civil, criminal, and religious matters through a system of councils or Sanhedrins. The Supreme Court was the Great Sanhedrin of Jerusalem.

We would expect the Jews to be hostile to the Roman government, and this they were, often with just cause, as when

⁷Luke 13:32

Pilate mingled some of the blood of some Galileans with their sacrifice.⁸ Jesus grew up when ill-will was very strong. We can imagine that every new taxation, each fresh cruelty was felt not only as a new token of servitude, but as an insult to God who had given Palestine to the Jews and chosen them for a great destiny. What did the Jews feel was the solution to this problem?

5. The Religious Answers to the Political Situation

We have noticed the four major sects within Judaism. The Essenes were entirely separated from the world, and so offered no practical solution. The Zealots, of course, promoted the idea of an armed revolt. They sought a son-of-David Messiah to lead them. Perhaps the crowds that first responded to Jesus believed Him to be such a man. Certainly Judas did, and there may have been others. There is nothing that can sweep a country so quickly as rampant patriotism and nationalism. This might indicate that the common people sympathized with the Zealots more than they did with the Pharisees, who looked down upon them for not keeping the entire Law. The Sadducees, of course, wishing to be on good terms with their governors promoted the idea of compromise. Here again we might wonder if the populous was not of this frame of mind. The Sadducees exercised a great influence by their control of the Temple. Besides, people tend to be materialistic, and perhaps the people wanted to have more Hellenization, and the greater benefits of the Roman rule. Thus the crowds that early

⁸Luke 13:1

followed Jesus might have thought His commands to love their enemies, to pray for those who persecute them, to go the second mile, and to turn the other cheek were platform tenets of a new Sadducean program for assimilation.

The Pharisees tended to promote the idea of apocalyptic vengeance upon Rome by divine intervention. Here too we might wonder if the populous were not of this frame of mind. Jesus began his ministry with John the Baptist's apocalyptic proclamation - 'The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand, repent and believe in the Gospel.'⁹

The Gospels give evidence of a huge early following. Perhaps it can safely be said that they went out to hear Him hoping He would be the leader for one of these three groups. But they found out He was not and so they deserted Him. What was His answer to the religious and political problem?

6. Jesus' Response

Denny, in his book, The Career and Significance of Jesus, felt that Jesus was conscious of a mission to His nation. His teaching and preaching was all directed toward saving His nation from impending disaster. He hoped enough Jews would accept His idea to change the national attitude toward Rome and thus save the nation from disaster and at the same time thrust it forth into its real mission in the world. This is both a political and a religious solution after the true genius of the prophets. However, it does not take into consideration the eschatological atmosphere of the first century. To

⁹Mark 11:14-15

say that Jesus was not affected by this element in His environment is sociologically and psychologically untenable. To say that He negatively responded to it by completely repudiating it raises the question of the imminent eschaton found in the New Testament. To say that the New Testament authors were affected by it but Jesus was not would raise the question of the reliability of our New Testament at the point where Jesus is recorded to have said that He expected the eschaton to come very soon. In this He was voicing the mistaken views of His day. The authors of the New Testament were also mistaken to think the eschaton would come with Christ's early return. We live in an atmosphere where the future is thought to be wide open and so we find eschatology very difficult to handle and although we must take it into consideration, especially in considering certain parables, just as we must take the first century's mistaken cosmology into account, it remains a problem for us.

Quite obviously the starting-point for Jesus' solution to the national problem was His own personal experience of God. He knew God to be a loving Father and Friend who was close at hand in nature and human life...not a tyrannical God demanding rites and rules but a God of loving care, free forgiveness and friendly companionship. This was true for all men - righteous and sinner, Jew and Gentile, Samaritan and Roman. The love of God went out to all. We can imagine that this experience came slowly to Jesus, not as He meditated on this in solitude so much as when He involved Himself in the issues of His day and struggled for an answer. Gradually His thoughts would be

organized into a specific message for the people. It began with the call of repentance for the House of Israel. Repentance literally means, 'change your mind' and so Jesus was demanding that they change their minds about God and believe that God was beginning to establish His rule. The Essene response of withdrawal was denied by Jesus as when He went out to seek and to save the lost. The Sadducean response of conserving the status-quo was denied by Jesus as when He reminded Israel of their missionary role. The Zealot response of armed rebellion was denied by Jesus as when He taught that the thirst for vengeance should be replaced by a love radical enough to include Samaritans and Romans and sinners. This was a love, which in practice meant non-resistance. The Pharisaic response of minute observance of the Law and Traditions and waiting in the presence of evil for God to intervene was denied by Jesus as when He put human life and fellowship as well as the struggle against evil above the external demands of the Law while insisting upon a strict obedience to God's way of love that lead Him to suffer the cross in trust. If the House of Israel would change their mind, now while there was still time, if they would replace their religious and national hatred with the experience of a loving father which automatically makes all men brothers, then their drift towards war with Rome would be avoided, and, more important, they would be about the Kingdom's work by re-instating their God-given vocation of leading all nations to a knowledge of God. But they would not. Jesus was formally charged as a Messianic conspirator against the government. The real reason why Jesus was condemned was that the

Sadducees refused Jesus' challenge to re-think their whole religious attitude. The people failed to support Him because He had demanded a change of heart, the spirit of forgiveness toward their enemies, love instead of vengeance, righteousness instead of ceremony. His message was rejected. The peoples' hatred and bitterness met inevitable results in the war of 66-73 A. D., when the Temple was destroyed and the nation obliterated as a political entity. But His death proved the steadfastness to the way of love and forgiveness which characterizes the true Son of God, which very estimate His disciples made and believed and taught. They received confirmation of this appraisal in the Resurrection. Their minds and hearts were converted and after they received God's Spirit, the content and confirmation of which was always to be the life and teachings of Jesus, they carried on His program.

7. The Conflict in The Early Church.

This all took place in Jerusalem which thereby became the center of primitive Christianity where the disciples taught that Jesus was the promised Messiah of prophetic scripture who had come to inaugurate the Kingdom of God on earth. They were Jews and wished to remain so. They adhered to the Temple worship and remained faithful to the Law insisting that Jesus had not come to destroy it but to fulfill it. The only difference between them and the Pharisees was their certainty, confirmed in the Resurrection, that Jesus, the Messiah, had already come and He was with them when two or

three were gathered together in His name and He was known as a vital presence in the breaking of bread. This common experience of the Risen Lord held the first church together. In theory and practice this Jerusalem church by its emphasis on the Law, circumcision, fasting, tended to constitute the Judaizing strain of the primitive church.

At this point it is necessary to remember that thousands of Jews had lived outside of Palestine for hundreds of years. The date for the establishment of the first of these non-Palestinian communities is hard to establish. They were the result of military dispersions and these communities were called Diaspora. "The real Dispersion began with the Babylonian Exile. Nebuchadnezzar transplanted to Babylonia the best of the Judean population....Here the Jewish religion was maintained; prophets like Ezekiel and priests like Ezra sprang up...."¹¹ The Diaspora communities soon forgot the Hebrew language and so they translated the Old Testament including the Apocrapha into Greek and called it the Septuagint. Now when these Greek-born Jews returned to Jerusalem they were called Hellenists and in the primitive Christian church there were these Hellenists. Stephen, the first Christian martyr, was their leader and they regarded missionary work as their main duty. They set aside the Jewish ritual requirements and looked down upon the Law. After Stephen was stoned, there arose a general persecution against those who shared his views, while the Palestinian

¹⁰ Acts 5:12

¹¹ Dictionary of the Bible, edited James Hastings, Scribners, 1909.

Christians - the Judaizers - remained untouched.

The first church of Jerusalem was essentially missionary minded but it restricted this work to the House of Israel although there were churches for Jews established in Samaria by the Hellenist Philip¹² and this indicates the beginning of a conflict. In Cyprus and Cyrene these Hellenists extended their preaching to the pagans with great success.¹³ These far-flung churches were all connected to the church in Jerusalem, spiritually and financially, and the Apostles had direct authority over them, according to Acts. Thus when a Christian church was established in the Diaspora the Jerusalem church sent a representative to supervise and instruct the new church. One such representative was Barnabas who, according to Acts, "sent for an assistant named Paul, from Tarsus."¹⁴

The history of Paul is well known and needs no documentation here. Suffice it to say that he was a Jew of the Diaspora who possessed Roman citizenship, was extremely well educated and pious and violently persecuted the Christians. Following a conversion experience and two years of preaching he went to Jerusalem to meet Peter and the Apostles for a two week period and then enjoyed thirteen years of missionary activity in Syria and Cilicia. During this time He worked for a year with Barnabas and John Mark.

¹² Acts 8:5, 9:31, Galatians 1:22

¹³ Acts 11:19

¹⁴ Hans Lietzmann: The Beginnings of the Christian Church
Nicholson and Watson, 1937, page 135.

The problem, which existed in germ in the Hellenistic church at Jerusalem and which had grown considerably on account of the mission to the Gentiles, of how the Gentiles should enter the church and what rules and laws they should follow now came to a head. Circumcision, ritual observances and prescriptions for cleanliness in regard to foods began to be overlooked not only by the Hellenist Christians of Jerusalem, but even more so by the new Gentile converts.

"Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem, negotiated with the 'pillars' of the primitive church: James and Peter and John and secured the recognition of their Gentile mission as free from the law, ie: baptized pagans had no need to be circumcized. The primitive church on its side declared that, in the future as in the past, it would exercise only a mission to the Jews. Financial support of the church at Jerusalem was recognized as a duty for the daughter - churches composed of Gentile Christians. This was the only obligation laid upon them. (Galatians 2:1-10)"¹⁵ The solution, however, was not complete. When the Gentile Christians ate together with the Jewish Christians at the Lord's Table in the presence of Jerusalem Judaizers, friction developed, especially between Paul, who thought the practice permissible, and Peter and Barnabas who avoided Table - fellowship with the unclean. Paul at this point took his own path and engaged in a wide missionary work, although he was always followed and troubled

¹⁵ Hans Lietzmann; The Beginnings of the Christian Church, Nicholson and Watson, 1937, page 140.

by the Judaizers. His letters do not specifically mention this split but, "we perceive behind the servants of Satan, the false apostles, and the spurious brethren, the shadows of the great figures in Jerusalem."¹⁶

The author of the Third Gospel was a companion of Paul and this upheaval in the Christian Church was part of the religious background to which Luke responded through his selection of material from the life of our Lord. There was a split over Christianity for Jews, and the modification of this which included Gentiles who had to become Jews religiously, as opposed to Christianity for all and everyone.

Paul preached a gospel in which God is Righteous and men are sinners and neither Jew, whose nation had received God's self-revelation in the Law, nor Gentile, who could come to know God through His Creation, can fulfill the Law and therefore only punishment could be expected. But God loves His people and all men and He shows this love by graciously dying for sinners. Salvation is thus a gift to those who believe in Christ and our only response is one of thanksgiving which expresses itself in daily life by healthy, wholesome living and sacrificial concern for one's brother. Paul, of all the apostles, laboured to free Christianity from Judaism although he remained faithful to his race and in all questions which this position raised, the Christian was guided by the Spirit of God,

¹⁶ Hans Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, Nicholson and Watson, 1937, page 143.

whose content was the life of Christ, and not by the written Law.

To conclude this brief survey of the history of the primitive church it only needs to be emphasized that there developed a real split within the church, not only between the Jewish - Christian church at Jerusalem and the Jewish - Christian Hellenistic church of Philip and Paul but also between these and the Apollos party, who emphasized philosophy and wisdom, and, the party 'of Christ'¹⁷ who felt they had several special revelations of the Risen Lord. We can imagine the influence these divisions had upon Luke's thinking

8. Persecution.

As time went on the relationship between the original church and the Jews become more strained. The Roman authorities, to make themselves acceptable to the Jews, adhered to Jewish attitudes and on such authority had James, the son of Zebedee, killed.¹⁸ The High Priests began to further their hatred of the Christians and had James, the leader of the Jerusalem church, stoned. This provoked the Jerusalem Christians to go to Pella. On top of such bloodshed there was growing unrest in the country and Jewish nationalism, which Jesus had hoped to alter, began to be more violent. The result of this unrest was the Jewish War of 66 A. D. in which the Jews at first were victorious but gradually, under the emperor Vespasian and his son Titus, Palestine was brought under control. In 70 A. D. Jerusalem and the

¹⁷ Corinthians 2:1-5.

¹⁸ Acts 12:1-9.

Temple were destroyed and the war ended in 73 A. D., the end of Israel as a political unit. The Jewish - Christians in Pella disappeared from recorded history.

When in July 64 A. D. Rome was a sea of fire for six days almost levelling the city, the Christians, now quite separate from Judaism, were blamed and violently persecuted. This was the first such persecution but not the last. "Christianity being, according to Tacitus and Suetonius, deemed, as early as the time of Nero, a maleficent and dangerous superstition, it has been widely assumed that it was, in itself, regarded as something criminal. and that the mere profession of it sufficed to prove the Christian a criminal. The Christians were, accordingly, in virtue of their religion, criminals, and like brigands were liable to persecution as pests of society. This, it is asserted, was henceforth the general principle on which Christianity was judged and its adherents treated by the imperial authorities."¹⁹

While the Christians were thought to be a sect of Judaism they enjoyed protection and freedom from the Roman authorities. But when the Jewish - Christians met persecution before their flight to Pella it became even more apparent how different were the Gentile and Hellenistic - Christians.

Under the emperor Domitian (81-96 A. D.) the persecution of Christians became very serious. He accepted the title of 'dominus' or 'deus', literally meaning Lord God, as

¹⁹ James MacKinnon: From Christ to Constantine. Longmans, Green and Co., 1936, page 176.

divinely chosen head of the empire and the Christians refused, "to take the oath of loyalty to the emperor as 'Lord' of the State."²⁰ Being a non-national religion Christianity was thought to be not only criminal, but a secret society cloaking under the guise of religion.

It is to these religious and political upheavals that the author of our third gospel responded by his selection of material from the life of Christ. He organized it to further his purpose, plan, and interests, which he no doubt interpreted to be intended by our Lord Himself.

²⁰ James Moffatt: The First Five Centuries of the Church, Hodder and Stoughton, 1938, page 21.

CHAPTER III

THE EMPHASES OF THE MATERIAL PECULIAR TO LUKE'S GOSPEL

Chapter I attempted to deal with the question of how the gospel of Luke was compiled, and Streeter's Proto-Luke hypothesis was accepted. The point made was the L, as outlined on pages 24 and 25, represents the notes Luke wrote down while in Caesarea on a missionary trip with Paul. Later, when a copy of Q came into his hands Luke combined it with L and this QL formed a short gospel. Still later this short gospel was expanded. Firstly by the addition of the sections derived from Mark and secondly by the prefixing of the birth and infancy stories.¹

Chapter II attempted to set out the first century background, politically and religiously, against which Jesus and then Luke can be interpreted. The Jews for centuries had a religious view of history in which God revealed His nature through historical events. The event of first importance was the experience of the Exodus out of which came the conviction that they were God's Chosen people. In subsequent years, the work the Jews were called to do, that of sharing their knowledge of God with all the nations was replaced on the one hand by the dream of rewards and privilege for themselves and on the other

¹T. W. Manson; The Sayings of Jesus, S.C.M., 1949, page 26

hand by punishment and destruction for their enemies. This attitude, strengthened by the conviction that God's Messiah would bring the dream to fulfillment, led them towards a ruinous war with Rome. While rejecting all the religious solutions to this dilemma, Jesus' response was to challenge his nation to change its ungodly attitude, hoping in this way not only to save his people but to bring them back to their original missionary vocation so that all the nations might come under the reign of God. Obviously, I am over-simplifying the actual events and yet I do feel it is helpful to try and see, even in the broadest terms, what was going on when God redeemed us by the gift of His Son.

Luke's response to God, as His will and purpose was made known in the world, differed from Jesus' response because the events were different. The Romans had learned through experience that the Jews were governed best by Jews, and by Jews who felt their demands were satisfactorily met. In other words, to keep the Jews governing themselves to Rome's profit, the Romans often complied with Jewish demands. Against this background, the early church received protection by the state as long as it was considered a Jewish sect. But as the church confronted the world in mission, the difference between itself (in spite of all its shameful divisions) and Judaism became apparent. The Romans, to please the angry Jews, had James, the son of Zebedee, killed. When Nero set fire to Rome and needed to blame someone, the Christians, hated by Jews and suspected by Rome for only acknowledging one lord, became the

scapegoat and general persecutions began. Luke responded to this situation by recording the life of Paul and the expansion of the church with the theme that the history of the church is devoid of political offense and therefore it should receive toleration. In addition to this response, I suspect that the Pharisees received more than their share of condemnation because they were intolerant of Rome. Luke especially wanted to show that the state was favourable both to Christ and the church and so he condemns the Pharisees and claims the Jews were responsible for Jesus' death.

In the face of divisions within the church, Luke counselled mission; the gospel for all men. Here we see the seeds for the modern need of unity in missions. The two are inseparable. In the face of persecution from outside the church, Luke counselled a love for the brethren that was so characteristic of Jesus his Lord. Rather than the strong emotions of vengeance and hate that are so often accepted today, Luke wrote about his Lord's concern for people; the outcast and sinner, the poor, women. In place of the power that could light human torches for Nero's garden, Luke wrote about the power of the Holy Spirit. These are some of Luke's special emphases as found in L which the third chapter will examine.

The Lucan material, as outlined on pages 24 and 25 is a very significant body of material if for no other reason than it represents approximately fifty-one percent of the Gospel. Interestingly, this factor of quantity is filled with a unique outlook and a distinct theology. For example, F. C. Grant

can write, "The apocalyptic-eschatological element which dominates almost the whole presentation of Mark and Matthew, and is conspicuous enough even in Q, is almost absent from L. The picture we derive from L is not that of the transcendent 'Son of Man' appearing upon earth as His own forerunner, so to speak, announcing His own impending advent (or return) in terms of even stronger certainty than John the Baptist had used, and gathering together a group who were to be His faithful followers and witnesses until He, Himself returned in glory. Instead, Luke presents us with a prophet who is almost something of a rabbi, or teacher, a first century Jewish prophet with a band of disciples who followed Him about, including several women; with friends here and there throughout the country in whose homes he is more than a guest. (Rather than "the Son of Man" who hath not where to lay His head," (Matthew 3:20 and Luke 9:53) He is one who travels about healing the sick and teaching the Gospel of pure and simple faith in God, having but slight relation to the future as conceived by the apocalyptists; and who, as Luke went on to relate, was put to death on a trumped-up charge, which at this distance in time is somewhat hard to make out, but which seems to have involved political activity of some sort. If we had only L to guide us, and lacked Q or Mark, it may be doubted that anyone would ever have supposed that Jesus was an apocalypticist, or thought the end of the age immediately at hand; (the 'prophetic' nonapocalyptic eschatology of L centres on the impending fall of Jerusalem) or claimed to be either the Jewish Messiah

or the Son of Man; or that he was condemned by the Jewish leaders or the Roman procurator on some such charges. Its fidelity to early Palestinian tradition is obvious. Needless to say, there is not the slightest trace of Pauline influence upon it, nor any trace of the Institutionalism apparent in the Gospel of Matthew. Thus, neither later Palestinian nor contemporary Gentile (or Hellenist) ecclesiastical developments have left any mark upon L. Like Q, it is a thoroughly primitive document; in some respects it would seem to be even more primitive."²

1. The Significant Placement of the Nazareth Incident

The lengthy quotation above prepares us to expect the Lucan material to have a number of special motifs. Since most of these can be developed from the book of Isaiah Chapter 61 verses 1 and 2, which Jesus reads during a visit to his home town, we shall begin with an examination of that visit.

This incident (4:16-30) is placed much later in the life of Jesus by Matthew, (13:53-58) and by Mark, (6:1-6) and rightly so, as the references to great deeds performed in Capernaum certainly indicate. But in Luke, this event comes earlier, before there is any opportunity for activity in Capernaum - even though in verse 23, Jesus refers to significant things done in Capernaum. Obviously this story has been taken out of its more natural context and sequence of events

² F. C. Grant; The Gospels; Their Origin and Growth, Harper 1957, page 62-63.

and has been deliberately put right at the beginning of Jesus' ministry. Its position therefore suggests that Luke felt this to be a program for the ministry that followed, and formed the proclamation of the saving work of our Lord. There will be no attempt to demonstrate whether or not Jesus wished men to see in this quotation from Isaiah the leading ideas of His ministry, but the attempt now will be made to indicate that Luke did deliberately put this incident first because this was to be Jesus' program as Luke emphasized it in his Gospel, in order to meet the religious and political needs of the day. Indeed, placed as it is at the beginning of Jesus public ministry, the Nazareth story serves as a prolude to the whole of Luke-Acts and to the entire account of the emergence of Christianity as a non Jewish religion."³

Let us examine the passage. Jesus returns to his home town, Nazareth. This is in contrast to the more vague 'to His own country' found in Matthew 13:54 and Mark 6:1. But we expect this of an historian who sets out to 'write an orderly account.' (1:3) Jesus stands up to read and is given the Book of Isaiah. Apparently it can not be determined whether Jesus selected this passage from Isaiah, which was the privilege of the reader, or whether it happened to be the section fixed by the Jewish lectionary. Plumptre makes the interesting point that, "in the calendar of modern Jews, the lessons from Isaiah run parallel with those from Deuteronomy. The chapter

³ Interpreter's Bible; Volume 8, page 75.

which He reads stands as the second lesson for the Day of Atonement. We cannot prove that the existing order was obtained in the time of our Lord's ministry, but everything in Judaism rests mainly on old traditions; and there is therefore nothing extravagant in the belief that it was on the Day of Atonement that the great Atoner thus struck what was the keynote of His whole work."⁴ This keynote is actually a chord which includes Luke's emphasis on the spirit, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me", his emphasis on the poor, "He has anointed me to preach good news to the poor", his emphasis on the outcasts and sinners, "he has sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind", his emphasis on women, "to set at liberty them that are bruised." The last phrase of Luke's slightly altered quotation from Isaiah - to preach the acceptable year of the Lord, begs the question, to whom? We will see that the answer extends firstly to all the Jews, who reject Him; secondly to the Samaritans, who also reject Him; and so as God moves through those times and His purpose is discerned, the gospel is proclaimed to all. Thus the universal mission of the church is undertaken and recorded in the Book of Acts. Since this universal note is the most prominent element in Luke's material, I will consider it first.

⁴ E. H. Plumptre; The Gospel of St. Luke, Cassell, Petter, Galpin and Co., 1879, page 63

2. Special Motifs

(a) The Universal Note - The first hint of a universal note can be derived from the angel's words to the Shepherds, " ... I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." (2:10) This hint is drawn out into full view when Simeon takes the baby Jesus and says, " ... mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles ... " (2:30-32) Probably Luke selected this kind of birth story in contrast to the Matthew birth stories because it supported his experience on the mission field. Luke pursues the point when both he and Matthew borrow from the Marcan record of John the Baptist's ministry by quoting Isaiah 40 for an extra two verses just so it can be said, "And all flesh shall see the salvation of God." (3:6) We remember that Luke had travelled with Paul on the field where this was an ongoing reality. His source quoted Isaiah 40:3. But Luke knew that Isaiah 40 verse 6 struck this universal note and so he does not resist it. Similarly, it is natural for him to extend the genealogy from Matthew's Abraham, the father of the Jews, to Adam, the father of mankind. (3:23-38) Again, according to Luke 4:25-27, Jesus reminded His countrymen that Elijah had not been sent to the widows of Israel, but to a Gentile in the land of Sidon and that Elisha has not cleansed the many lepers in Israel but only Naaman, the Syrian. We have already commented on the significant placement of this incident; that for Luke it is the program

of what is to follow. His most sustained emphasis is the universal legitimacy of the gospel and here during the Nazareth incident he records two stories which drive this point home. So much so in fact that Jesus' countrymen planned to throw Him over a cliff as the preliminary to stoning.

This rejection at Nazareth soon propelled Jesus to steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem through the land of the Samaritans. Unlike the righteous Pharisees, Jesus deliberately goes to this race with whom no pious Jews would associate. But the gospel is also for the Samaritans and even though they too reject Him, which allows the gospel to go legitimately to the Gentiles, Luke retains a special regard for them. For example, it is a Samaritan rather than a Jew who is the hero of one of Jesus' most memorable parables. (10:28-37) Again, when Jesus instructs ten lepers how to be healed, only one, a grateful Samaritan returns to praise God and give thanks. (17:11-19) Perhaps Luke intended us to regard the whole section of 9:51 - 13:14) as the record of a Samaritan ministry.

During this Samaritan journey, Luke records the appointment of the seventy emissaries, a number easily associated with the Gentiles since the Hebrew text of Genesis chapter 10 gives the number of the Gentile nations as seventy. While the Interpreter's Bible points out that Luke may have used "seventy as the number of missionaries on this occasion only

because it was a round number for a large company,"⁵ the point is that all these little references pile up until it must be admitted that the universal note was definitely one of Luke's gospel commitments.

Tracing this commitment still further we see that when Luke is writing about the fate of Jerusalem, he suggests there will be a period for the conversion of the Gentiles. (21:24) This is really awkward for him. Actually he is writing about the time before Jesus' crucifixion after Jerusalem had been destroyed, and his own experience on the field, which was proof that the gospel was for all, compounded matters. And so while linking all three stages together, only one clear factor emerges and that is his universal element. On this great note he ends the Gospel. The risen Christ says, "Thus it is written that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem." (24:46-47) We can just see it and hear it going out to the ends of the earth.

The universal note while sustained in the Gospel can also be seen from the omissions which Luke considered would hinder this commitment. For example, he does not record Jesus' command, "Go not into any way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matthew 10:5-6) Nor is

⁵ Interpreter's Bible; Volume 8, page 184.

there anything comparable to the saying of Jesus, "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matthew 15:24) Again the story of the Syrophoenician woman is not reproduced. (Mark 7:26)

Another way in which the universal note can be pointed up is to notice the changes Luke makes in his sources. At 12:30 in a passage from Q, Luke changes Matthew's Gentiles to read, "the nations of the world." Then too, at 13:29, also from Q, Luke adds to Matthew's "many shall come from the east and the west," the other two corners of the world.

We have examined the Gospel and its omissions and additions in relation to the other synoptics. Moving on into the New Testament we naturally expect Luke's second volume to sustain his Gospel commitment since his purpose is to tell the story of the rise and expansion of the Church from Jerusalem to all the world. As the companion of the great missionary who established churches, Luke was so conscious that, "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus," (Gal. 3:28) that in Acts 17:26 he has Paul say, "And He made from one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth" Probably this concept of universalism came as much from Luke's practical experience on the field where he saw the Gentiles receiving the gospel as from the mind of Paul who, in Romans chapters 9 - 11, wrestled with the problem of the Jewish rejection of the gospel and the Gentiles' acceptance

of it. Coupled with these two facets of his experience was the conviction of, and commitment to, a universalism that actually sprang from the life and teachings of Jesus. This is demonstrated by the frequency with which Luke places this note on Jesus' lips. The reasons why Jesus went to Jerusalem and why He cleared the Court of the Gentiles as pointed out in chapter II should also be remembered.

In contrast to this are the other Gospels. Mark, the earliest written Gospel nowhere suggests that the gospel is for the Gentiles, and not once does he mention the Samaritans. Matthew only hints that the gospel may be for the Gentiles by quoting passages from Isaiah which teach this. But, at no point is he motivated to capitalize on Isaiah's universalism. In the Gospel of John, the word Gentile is never mentioned although he does refer to the Greeks and he does make the point that the disciples are to go out to the world even as God came to the world in Christ. Also, Jesus is quite at home in Samaria and at Sychar He is declared the Saviour of the world. We must conclude then that while the universal note is heightened in Luke's Gospel, it is obviously not foreign to the rest of the New Testament.

Luke came by this gospel commitment both from his practical experience on the field and from his attempt to protect Christianity from splits within and from persecution without. Primarily though, his universalism stemmed from his estimate of Jesus as the prophet. For Luke, as Grant pointed out, Jesus

was not the transcendent Son of Man, but a prophet. For example, Jesus claims for Himself the title and treatment of a prophet (4:24). Again, when Jesus raised the widow of Nain's son, the multitude "glorified God saying, A great prophet is arisen among us: and God has visited His people." (7:16) Not only does Jesus claim the role Himself and the multitudes recognize Him in this role, but Simon the Pharisee rejects the view that Jesus was a prophet, (7:30), a view which must have been taken by others. In Jesus' reply to Herod, He claims that a prophet cannot perish out of Jerusalem. (13:33) Finally, at 24:19 even His disciples on the road to Emmaus held the opinion that Jesus was a "prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people." And these passages are all from L. At this point we remember from Chapter II that the Old Testament prophets, when they were truest to their genius, insisted on the universal view. Israel's knowledge of God was to be shared with all the nations and the Jews were chosen to bring this about. And so the prophets rejected Ezra's and Nehemiah's exclusive nationalism. This universal aspect of their message reached its peak in Isaiah. It is important to realize that Luke has Jesus read from Third Isaiah which begins, "Arise, shine; for your light has come ... and all nations shall come to your light." We can appreciate then that Luke portrays the universal note not only because on the mission field the gospel was already going to all the nations and not only because in the

face of internal division the mission of universalism precludes unity, but also and basically because his experience of the spirit of Christ dictates the prophetic emphasis of universalism. The divisions in the Church today which so easily lead to a competition that hinders its proclamation of one Lord over all can only be healed by a return to the universal message found so clearly in the prophets, in the life and spirit of Christ and in such evangelists as Luke. Because when universalism is actively believed, unity is seen to be the other hand on the plow. This fact has been recently demonstrated by the fact that when the Mission of the Church became vital, the Ecumenical Movement was born. And when it is seen that the gospel is for all men, it does not allow that one race can be segregated from another race in either worship or in any other way since this fails to make concrete the fact of our fellowship in the presence of the Spirit of Christ who became flesh so that we might know our salvation lies in keeping together the material, social, economic and political with the spiritual.

(b) The Holy Spirit - This leads us into a discussion of the Holy Spirit as a special motif of the Lucan material. I believe this is a timely theme for four reasons. Firstly, we live at a time when materialism, secularism, scientism, socialism, communism, agnosticism, skepticism, cynicism and atheism are rampant. All of these tend to discount or deny the activity of God through His Spirit. At the same time,

the materialism of our time dominates the West in terms of money and science while it dominates the East in terms of its need for food, clothing and shelter. Again, the Spirit of God seems largely absent. Secondly, a growing conservatism, as represented by the Pentecostals, which tends to falsely distinguish between the material and the spiritual is deeply rooted in our minds. This is an eighteenth and nineteenth century inheritance which lingers in all our minds and adds confusion at a time when God is calling us to be clear sighted. Thirdly, our day is blessed with both domestic power in terms of machines and automation and with military power in terms of megaton bombs, missiles and interplanetary rocket ships. Power as characterized by the Spirit of God is largely unfathomable. Fourthly, we tend to think our world will go on and on being the best today and still better tomorrow and that gradually the Kingdom of God will come. Balancing this heady enterprise is the conservative branch of the Christian Church which tends to think that our present age is the evil age and following a destructive cataclysm, the Kingdom of God will be ushered in with the return of Christ. The concept that we are in the midst of two ages, the veiled Kingdom of God and the naked Kingdom of evil, and that both may well grow side by side until the Day of Judgment, and that there is a life to be lived in suffering love today in the one for the other has largely escaped our experience. Perhaps because of this lack of experience in our day, God is often working

outside the Church in order to prune it back to its real life, life in the Spirit for a world loved by God.

Luke's program for Jesus' ministry, 4:18-19, begins with the quotation, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me." If Luke's motivation for setting this incident at the beginning of Jesus' ministry was because it suitably outlined the motifs to be developed, then we should expect to find the concept of the Spirit emphasized in L. And this is what we do find.

The Birth Narratives are alive with the Holy Spirit. Practically everyone has it. Its activity fills people, over-shadows them, strengthens them, informs them. In two chapters, there are nine references to the working of the Spirit. At 4:1 where Luke is following Mark, the Spirit drives Jesus into the wilderness but Luke cannot resist this opportunity to say that Jesus was "full of the Holy Spirit," and that He "returned in the power of the Spirit." (4:14) Besides the qualities of filling, over-shadowing, strengthening and informing people, it is so vital and vibrant that Luke describes the raising of Jarius' daughter by saying, "her spirit returned." (8:55) It is life itself. Further to this, at 10:21, where Luke is following Q, he cannot explain Jesus' thanksgiving except by saying, "In that same hour He rejoiced in the Holy Spirit." This suggests that the thankful life is so closely associated with the Will of God, there is infusion of the person with the presence of God. In chapter 24, the Risen Lord proclaims the promise that the disciples

will, "be clothed with power from on high." This promise is fulfilled with the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost as recorded in Acts chapter 2. The evidence indicates that the Spirit of God plays an active part in the story of Salvation as interpreted and transmitted by Luke. This bolsters our confidence in believing that Luke deliberately moved the Nazareth incident ahead to the very beginning of Jesus' ministry because it was the program of what was to follow. It begins with, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me ...", and we have seen how the Spirit pervades the whole story.

Naturally, the Book of Acts carries on this motif. In fact, the Spirit is referred to fifty-seven times. Just as the Birth Narratives were alive with the Spirit, so is the whole Book of Acts. Barrett says, "No more certain statement can be made about the Christians of the first generation than this: they believed themselves to be living under the immediate government of the Spirit of God."⁶ Every major event in the life of the primitive Church is imbued by the Holy Spirit.

Of course the activity of the Spirit is documented in the whole New Testament. For example, Paul's letters sustain this statement practically on every page. There are over one hundred references to the Spirit's activity. We may confidently say it is the content of the times between the Crucifixion and Christ's return. In John's Gospel, with seventeen references

⁶ C. K. Barrett; The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, Macmillan, 1947, page 1.

to the Spirit, it has such a vital place that, "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." (3:5) Interestingly, E. C. Colwell and E. L. Titus call a study in the fourth Gospel, "The Gospel of the Spirit".

When we turn to the other two Synoptic Gospels, Matthew and Mark, we find in contrast few references to the activity of the Holy Spirit. Mark has six references, Matthew twelve, while there are seventeen in Luke and, as we noted above, fifty-seven in the Acts. Barrett suggests that the eschatological framework of the Gospels explains this contrast. As noted earlier, Matthew and Mark expected the Son of Man to return very soon. While Jesus' use of this nomenclature was original in that He linked the concept of the Suffering Servant with Daniel's apocalyptic Son of Man, His disciples misunderstood it. The best example of this misunderstanding recorded in the Gospels occurs when Peter confesses at Caesarea Philippi the nature of Jesus' identity only to be severely reprimanded because he objected to the idea of Jesus' suffering. Not only was Jesus' vocation of suffering misunderstood, but the disciples mistakenly expected the completed Kingdom of God immediately after the crucifixion. What need then for the Spirit? Probably the place of the Spirit is limited in Matthew and Mark due to their eschatological perspective as Barrett suggests, but it was also due to the eschaton's companion concept, their estimate of Jesus. We saw that Luke thought of Jesus more in terms of a prophet than the apocalyptic

Son of Man found in Matthew and Mark. It is well known that the Spirit of God, was closely connected with the prophets of the Old Testament, and so we can see how this furthered Luke's emphasis. However, Matthew and Mark wanted to say that Jesus was much more than a prophet and in consequence they limit the work of the Spirit which always attends a prophet. And, expecting no interval between the Crucifixion and the Parousia they really have no need for God's guiding and strengthening Spirit.

While the Spirit in Luke fills, over-shadows, strengthens and informs people and is indeed their very life, it also has a material quality. For example, at 24:37-39, when the Risen Lord is walking about, the disciples are terrified because they, "supposed that they beheld a spirit." Jesus calms them by pointing out his hands and feet, presumably because they had nail holes in them, and He says, "spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having." Luke concludes this discussion by having Jesus eat a piece of broiled fish. And so while the Risen Christ as the Spirit of God is a new humanity, He is still very much of matter as we know it today. Again, since the Spirit is the creative life-giving power of God, then references to God's arm or to His hand can also be taken to refer to God's Spirit. For example, chapter 1 verse 51 says, "He hath showed strength with His arm, He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their heart." This obviously

is the work of the Spirit referred to in a material way. Then too, when John the Baptist was eight days old and Zacharias is granted his speech again, the people are amazed and say, "What then shall this child be? For the hand of the Lord was with him." (1:66) Here again, the Spirit could replace "hand" and retain the meaning. Perhaps the best example of the material nature of the Spirit as Luke understood it is at 3:22 during the Baptism of Jesus where the Holy Spirit descended "in a bodily form" as a dove. As well, Luke changes the good things that the Father is willing to give His children to read the Holy Spirit (11:13). And finally, in place of, "If I by the Spirit of God cast out demons", (Matthew 12:28) Luke writes, "But if I by the finger of God cast out demons." (11:20) Naturally Luke carries this concept of the material quality of the Spirit into the Book of Acts and so Spirit at Pentecost is accompanied by a terrific sound, like the rushing of wind and the disciples see tongues as of fire. Thus, in an age of rampant secularism and materialism we are warned on the one hand not to discount the truly spiritual quality of all that is material and on the other hand not to falsely distinguish between the material and the spiritual, as much by God's Word to man in the Incarnation as by the New Testament's understanding and experience of the Holy Spirit.

The suggestion has been made that the activity of the Spirit is the power of God at work in His world. It is common to associate power with the Spirit. For example, 1:17 reads,

"... in the spirit and power of Elijah," and 1:35 reads, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee and the power of the Most High shall over-shadow thee." Also we noticed how the Risen Lord proclaims the promise to the disciples that they will, "be clothed with power from on high" (24:49) and how this was fulfilled in the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. In an age of powerful domestic machinery and powerful military weapons, we need to recapture the concept and experience of the living power of God who fulfills His purpose through the power of His Spirit in sacrificial love.

The primary point of this section is to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit is one of Luke's special motifs. This was attempted in the first part of the section and then two significant qualities of the Spirit, as material and as power, were discussed. One reason why Matthew and Mark limited the activity of the Spirit as mentioned was that they expected the Parousia to immediately follow the Crucifixion and so there was really no time for the work of the Spirit. It remains now to see how the delay of the Parousia influenced Luke's concept of the Holy Spirit.

Luke, of course, had a first-hand experience of the extent of the Spirit's activity in the early Church and no doubt he reads this back into the Gospel. Also, as we have seen, his estimate of Jesus as a prophet supported this experience since in the Old Testament, the Spirit always attended the prophets. But mainly he was influenced by the

delay in the Parousia. For example, Mark and Matthew understood John the Baptist's mission as a preparation for the Mightier One who would bring the Kingdom which for them implied the Day of Judgment with the end of this evil age. Luke, in contrast, interprets this preparation to mean the end is not near. He separates the threat of Judgment from the time when the Judgment will take place and so he is able to use John the Baptist's teaching. What John seems to be saying is, 'do your best in the circumstances, treat one another kindly, abstain from extortion and bullying, till the Kingdom comes, and it will be coming so quickly there is no need for a more radical change.' From Luke's view, the Parousia has been delayed and until it comes, the proper conduct is concern for those about us. This humanitarian concern seems to be God's Will and the work of the earthly Christ as suggested by Jesus' reply to the question of His identity, "Go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached." This necessary work, especially in Africa and Asia, is carried on today through the activity of the Spirit whose content is the person of Jesus Christ as known in the Bible. Today as we face two forms of materialism, the affluent materialism of the West and the insufficient materialism of the East, as well as the false distinction made between the spiritual and the material, we are glad for God's Word which gives many the courage to

walk the precipice which says on the one hand that what is material is spiritual and on the other hand that the ultimate mystery of life is beyond the material as we know it.

While Matthew and Mark represent the expectation of an early return of Jesus Christ and with Him the Kingdom of God, Luke seems to believe the Kingdom has already begun to come, (17:20-21) and that there are signs of its presence, (12:54-57). Of course, this does not mean that the Kingdom has come in all its fullness. This age, as Luke suggested when he wrote, "And when the devil had completed every temptation he departed from Him for a season," is still in the grip of evil. But the Kingdom has begun to come in the midst of the Kingdom of Evil and its signs are the preaching of the Gospel and the gift of the Holy Spirit, while it has not yet fully come. This is the scheme of time which not only helps us to more adequately understand Luke, but which allows Luke to have a more generous and creative place for the Spirit's activity than was allowed to either Matthew or Mark. Our need to know that the Kingdom is here today and that the material, powerful Spirit of God is not only a guarantee of this fact, but the force for living in the direction of the life of Christ is very real.

(c) The Poor - Luke sets the Nazareth incident at the beginning of Jesus' ministry because this includes the motifs he was to emphasize. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He hath anointed me to preach good news to the poor." I want now to

discuss Luke's appreciation of Jesus' sympathy for the poor, as well as the corresponding warnings to the rich.

The importance of the Magnificat, 1:46-55, for this motif can be seen in the fact that almost fifty percent of the references come from these ten verses. This is one of the touchstones for the Social Gospel, and remains the cornerstone for any gospel that will be useful in a world so loved by God that he became flesh and dwelt among us full of grace and truth. In the Magnificat, Luke draws our attention to the fact that Jesus' parents were working-class people. For example, Mary rejoices that God should look, "upon the low estate of His handmaid." (1:48) This is a wonderful thing that has happened to her and her praise is correctly directed to God. He is the one who has done great things. He has, for instance, not only put down princes from their thrones, but He has exalted them of low degree. (1:52) And again, He has filled the hungry with good things, while the rich He has sent empty away. (1:53) As we see these ideas building up we can appreciate Luke's understanding of the circumstances surrounding the birth of Jesus. According to Luke, Jesus was born in the traditional manger in a stable behind the Inn. (2:7) In contrast, Matthew has the place of Jesus' birth in a house and he rounds the story off with Wise Men of no small means who bring expensive presents. This certainly was not Luke's information. Jesus was in the stable's manger and He was honoured by the men working the shift that night; the shepherds.

Concern for the poor seems to have been one of John the Baptist's teachings. For example, 3:10-14 which teaches that the repentant life, which ought to bear fruit in very practical ways, is the changed life of concern for one's fellow. Luke is the only one who records John's teachings, one of which was that men should share their possessions with the needy. The Beatitudes, so familiar in their Matthew setting are altered by Luke. Rather than delivered from a mountain, Luke records Jesus giving them from a plain. The word difference is even more spectacular. In place of Matthew's, "blessed are the poor in spirit," a sort of philosophic pronouncement, Luke has the simpler and probably more original, "Blessed are ye poor." (6:20) While most commentaries at this point prefer Matthew and Luke to really mean the same thing, we cannot fail to remember that Jesus is speaking to his disciples who have given up all to follow Him as well as to the multitudes. Similarly, where Matthew has "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness," Luke has, "Blessed are ye that hunger now." (6:21) This seems to be historically more genuine. In addition to these changes, Luke records stories and parables that serve as warnings to the rich. And so set beside the beatitudes are the corresponding woes, "Woe unto you that are rich; Woe unto ye that are full now." (6:24-25) We can guess that this teaching was supported in his mission field experience. The rich are generally more conservative, with a greater number of vested interests and so they tend to resist change that offers little materially except service

and suffering. Another incident of warning to the rich is the parable of the Rich Fool who stored up grain in bigger barns when, no doubt, there were folk in need within a stone's throw. This sounds so familiar to our own experience. We tend to do as well as we can for ourselves when most of the world lacks minimal requirements about which we can claim no ignorance. It is so difficult to follow Christ and have material goods, largely because we have a non-biblical idea of private ownership. The Bible teaches that everything belongs to God and what we have is in trust to be used rightly. For example, Jesus told of a man, who made a splendid supper and invited, not his friends, but the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind. Perhaps if we did this sort of thing, our children would more easily catch the spirit of something more abiding than when our friends come and the children have to be quiet so the endless talk can go on unhindered. In fact, Luke's impression of the wrong use of wealth is that it makes for poor friends, or no friends on earth and certainly no treasure in heaven. For example, in the parable of the Lost Son, the younger boy "wasted his substance with riotous living." That would be difficult to do without making some bad fellows. But when he runs out, the friends are gone too, "and no man gave unto him." (15:11-32) The parable of the Unjust Steward seems to teach that if a bad man will go to great lengths to get friends for his own selfish interests, then the good man ought surely to

take some trouble to make friends in a better way and for better ends. (16:1-12) The Pharisees are scolded for being lovers of money and they are reminded that what is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God. (16:14-15) The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus also points up the peril of the selfish use of wealth. Here was a man who lived in luxury while at his door lived a man whose need went unrelieved. (16:19-31) God seems to require not only the expression of mercy and forgiveness to the morally frail, but also the generous and gracious help to all victims of poverty, sickness or any other ill that may come upon them.

Luke's concern for the poor and his admonition for the selfish use of wealth is the authentic message of Jesus Christ who, as Paul so splendidly put it, "For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sake He became poor, so that by His poverty you might become rich." (2 Cor. 8:9) Jesus understood enough about the poor that He knew how thoroughly a housewife would sweep her house if she lost the grocery money and He was appreciative enough about the right use of wealth that when Zacchaeus outlines his manner of sharing his wealth, Jesus says, "Today salvation has come to this house." (19:1-10) As we have attempted to indicate, this motif is found throughout the Gospel. Once again this supports the suggestion that Luke moved the Nazareth story forward because it outlined motifs he was to develop.

We would expect this sympathy for the poor to be carried over into the Book of Acts. Interestingly, the apostles and all who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ pooled their useable possessions and either sold the rest or distributed them to the needy. (2:44-45) Since the majority of the early converts came from the poorer people and slaves, it is likely there were many in need. On one occasion where Peter heals a lame man, he says, "I have no silver and gold, but I give you what I have; in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk." (3:1-16) However, among the apostles there were apparently no needy persons as everyone sold all and gave it into the pool to be given to the needy. (4:32-37) This was a firm requirement since one family that attempted dishonesty died. (5:1-11) On the other hand, the honest and generous use of wealth is honoured by God. (10:4) While the concern for the poor is not as sustained in the Book of Acts, this is no doubt due to the different theme. The Gospel is the record of a man's life who was concerned about the poor, the right use of wealth and Luke selected stories and remembered them because they support his theme of the universality of the gospel. It is for the whole world and this includes not only the periphery on the mission field but the poor that always collect around the hubs, railroad yards and wharfs of every village and city.

We have seen Luke's sympathy for the poor and his warnings to the rich, both in the Gospel and in the Acts. What about the other Gospels? Mark has three references to the poor, two of which are really warnings to the rich, (10:17-22 and

and 12:41-44) while the other is a back-handed sympathy for the poor. (14:3-10) Matthew has four references to the poor. The famous beatitude that speaks about the happiness of those who are poor in spirit which is hardly a reference to the budget-harrowed poor. (1:3) Jesus' reply to the question of His identity, "... and the poor have good news preached to them." (11:5) The third reference is to the rich man who was told to sell all he had and give it to the poor which again is more a warning to rich folk than sympathy for poor folk. (19:21) The final reference is from the Marcan story of the woman anointing Jesus with precious ointment and when the disciples complain that it could be sold and the money given to the poor, Jesus remarks, "She had done a beautiful thing to me. For you always have the poor with you ..."

(14:3-10) This is the back-handed sympathy for the poor noted above. John has two references to the poor, both of which include Judas Iscariot. One suggests that Judas, who was in charge of the common purse really did not care for the poor, while the other suggests that the purse was often used to assist the poor. (12:1-2 and 13:29) Luke, in contrast, has seven references to the poor although his sympathy is not confined to mere word usage as we attempted to show above. Only Luke's Gospel could support the claim, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He hath anointed me to preach good news to the poor." Tracing through the usage of the word rich, we find that while Mark has two references, Matthew three, and John none, Luke has twelve.

The writings of Paul support Luke's interest in the poor. He who so gladly accepted the responsibility to remember the poor saints in Jerusalem adequately sums up our Lord's concern at this point by reflecting upon the whole revelation of God in human flesh and saying, "You know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that you through His poverty might become rich." (2 Cor. 8:9) If this can be said any better Paul does it himself; "Let each of you look not only to his own interests, but also to the interests of others. Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus, who, though He was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross." (Phil 2: 4-8) And so, "Bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." (Gal. 6:2) This survey indicates that Luke's understanding of Jesus' sympathy for the poor is not in any sense unique to the New Testament, but it is from his special material that this concern is rooted.

(d) The Outcaste and Sinner - Jesus' concern for the poor included a merciful attitude towards the morally bankrupt and this motif is developed from the program of Jesus' ministry. "He has sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind."

We need to remember at this point that the Pharisees and Scribes considered those who did not strictly obey the letter of the Law, outcastes and sinners. The Gospels are then quite authentic in recording the Pharisees' rebuke of Jesus and His followers, on different occasions, for their obvious disregard of the external requirements of the Law, especially the Levitical laws concerning the ceremony of cleanliness before meals. More significant was their consternation that Jesus would constantly associate with publicans and sinners. Luke stresses this association, which takes place very often around the intimacy of a meal. For example, Luke replaces Mark's story of the woman who anointed Jesus' head (14:3-9) with the account of the penitent sinner who wet His feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kissed His feet and anointed them with ointment" while He was having a meal in the house of a Pharisee. (7:36-50) This story illustrates the thought with which the preceding section concluded, Jesus is, "a friend of publicans and sinners." (7:35) The woman is not simply a sinner, a rather vague comment. The Pharisee suggests by his comment, "what manner of woman this is ... she is a sinner," that her occupation is prostitution. Jesus says, "Her sins, which are many ..." suggests a steady diet. But quite obviously she has been released from this activity because of her great demonstration of love. She has been forgiven. Jesus, therefore, states this condition as a matter of plain fact. This represents

faith in the God who loves and is willing to forgive all His children, despite their sordid pasts, and for this reason Jesus says, "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace."

Luke's interest in homes and meals is not entirely restricted to stories about sinners. For instance, Jesus is found in the home of his friends, Martha and Mary. (10:38) He dines with a Pharisee. (11:37 and 14:1-24) Eating and drinking is a large part of life and Jesus is there. An ironic note comes when the publicans and sinners were drawing near to him. (15:1) The Pharisees and Scribes on seeing this say, "This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them." Whom has he eaten with more? This criticism gives Luke the opportunity to set forth his great parables on the Lost. At a point where Luke is following Mark, a similar protest against a meal in Levi's house with publicans and others was the occasion of the saying, "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." (5:31-32)

The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican not only adds further support to Luke's emphasis on Jesus' concern for the sinner, but it gives us a springboard to Paul's central doctrine that man is saved, not by works of righteousness, but by faith which cannot come without a recognition of one's helpless sinfulness. (18:9-14) For only in this situation can one appreciate the love of God in Jesus Christ who died for us while we were yet sinners. Even Peter, in Luke's Gospel,

recognizes he is a sinner. (5:8) This should not surprise us when we remember Luke's close association with Paul who once wrote, "... all men have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God." (Romans 3:23) The colourful story of Jesus and Zacchaeus calls forth the statement which sums up Luke's interest in the poor, the sinners and women, "The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost." (19:10) In walking through the streets Jesus spies the resourceful little rich man up in a tree. We should get to know inventive, creative people. How better than over a meal? So Jesus said, "Come down, I must abide at thy house." Just everyone was upset. "He is gone in to lodge with a man that is a sinner." How different was Jesus' attitude. All life and everyone in it is the object of persistent, personal, purposive love. As Luke sees the life of Jesus, the Gospel is not for Jews only, but for all people. And this asserts that the Gospel is not just for Gentiles and Samaritans, but for the outcasts and sinners within the Jewish race. Or wherever they are found, even if it be next door, or up a tree. It is profoundly significant for me that Jesus was known by Cleopas and his friend who travelled the Emmaus road, not in the knowledge of scripture, but in the breaking of bread. (24:13-35) God must be known and acknowledged in our homes, around our tables, if He is to be effectively known in our churches. Let me conclude this Lucan motif by the most conclusive and searching reminder of Jesus' concern for the sinner. On the cross, it is a criminal

who is to be first with Jesus in Paradise. (23:39-43) And only Luke records Jesus' words, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."

When we move out into the Book of Acts we find not one mention of the word sinful, sinner or erring one - hamartolos. Since the common authorship of Luke-Acts cannot be seriously refuted, the only possible explanation is that Luke's theme is changed from recording the life of a human personality that was concerned about outcastes and sinners to telling the story of the expansion of the primitive church.

Both Matthew and Mark indicate that they know Jesus was associated with publicans and sinners to the extent that He ate with them, but it is not their particular emphasis. This can be demonstrated on word usage alone. Matthew has five references, Mark has six while Luke has seventeen. John is particularly silent on this theme only mentioning it once. Paul, of course, is very conscious of sinners because as he understands the Gospel, "God shows His love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." (Romans 5:6) But this is certainly not the personal, domestic concern that Jesus exhibits in Luke.

(e) The Women - The Gospel is for all; Greeks and Gentiles, Samaritans, the poor, outcastes and sinners. Luke extends this universal note to include women. Naturally, women play a prominent role at the birth of children and since Luke records both the birth of John the Baptist and the birth of

Jesus, their central place is guaranteed. We remember that Mark has no birth stories, and although Matthew records the birth of Jesus, there is a significant difference in comparison with Luke. For example, in Matthew, the angel announces the birth of Jesus to Joseph who, apparently has some reluctance to take for himself a wife already pregnant. But in Luke, the angel comes directly to Mary to make the announcement. Luke continues this emphasis on women. The angel tells Mary about Elizabeth's good fortune which prompts Mary to spend three months with her kinswoman. When Jesus is taken to the Temple, Anna, a prophetess and a widow, makes a significant witness, "to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem." (2:36-38) Luke takes special care to mention her background which demonstrates more than a mild interest.

This interest is sustained throughout the Gospel. We remember Jesus' telling reference to Elijah who went to Zarephath, the widow of Sidon (4:25-26) Only Luke records Jesus' sympathy for the widow of Nain (7:11-19) We will also remember in another connection, the woman who was a sinner from the city. (7:36-50) Luke especially draws out this story with intimate details of the anointing. He alone fills in the details of the women surrounding Jesus; how they followed Him, of what disease they had been cured, and how they supported Him with their money. In the same way that Luke shows his concern for the outcaste and sinner, he shows it for women. Not only does he mention them, but he appears to be really interested in them.

undoubtedly, this interest motivates him to select and remember stories about Jesus which reveal the intimacy of the women, their private conversations, their special characteristics and interests. For example, he records Jesus' visit to the home of Martha and Mary and explores the feelings and interests of them both. Only Luke mentions how, "a certain woman", blessed Jesus' mother which sets up the saying, "Yes, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." (11:27-28) He records the healing of a woman on the Sabbath, which is the point of the story, but also mentions her infirmity so that she becomes a real person.

Actually, there are two parables in which a woman is the main character. We have pointed out in another section how Jesus is familiar with the women's habit of keeping track of the grocery money (15:3-10) and the blessed persistence of women is pointed up at 18:1-8.

Luke records the incident where the women weep over Jesus' march to Calvary. At the time of the Resurrection, all the Synoptic Gospels have a prominent role for the women in the finding of the empty tomb. But whereas Mark mentions Mary Magdalene and Mary, the mother of James and Salome, Matthew mentions Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, Luke has Mary Magdalene and Mary, the mother of James and Joanna and the other women. (24:10)

Luke's interest in women is incontestable. It may well stem from the greater emancipation of women in the Gentile

world as compared to the Jewish treatment in the first century and yet, pagan women suffered a greater degradation in the Gentile world. Luke, perhaps, remembered Paul's doctrine that in Christ there is neither male nor female, (Gal. 3:28) and attempted to root this in the life of Jesus. I personally feel this interest is an authentic note of the man of Nazareth who came to "set at liberty them that are bruised."

The interest in women is carried over into Acts. After the Resurrection and Ascension, the disciples spent their time in the upper room in prayer, "together with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus. (1:14) The early converts to Christianity were both "men and women". (5:14 and 3:12) Both men and women are hauled away to prison in Saul's mistaken loyalty to God (3:3 and 9:12) and "the Jews incited the devout women of high standing and the leading men of the city and stirred up persecution against Paul and Barnabas and drove them out of their district." (13:50) At Philippi, Paul and Luke, "went outside the gate to the riverside" on the Sabbath and "spoke to the women who had come together." One of these women, Lydia, had her heart opened and she was baptized "with her household" and then, characteristically to Luke, she invited them home with her. (16:11-15) When Paul argues in the synagogue of Thessalonica, some people were persuaded to join Paul; "a great many of the devout Greeks and not a few of the leading women." (17:4) Paul preached in Beroea with a similar result;

"Many of them therefore believed, with not a few Greek women of high standing as well as men." (17:12) Although there is not the intimacy that we noticed in the Gospel, still the inclusion of women into the early church was a significant undertaking. Those who had a low, despised, chattel-type existence in the first century were made welcome members of the Body of Christ.

What do we find in Matthew and Mark? They do, of course, mention women. Both record the story of the anointing of Jesus with ~~perfumed~~ alabaster. Both record the major role of the women at the empty tomb. Both include the story of the healing of the woman with an issue of blood. Matthew makes it more personal than Mark. For instance, in the Sermon on the Mount, he has Jesus penetrate the heart of the commandment, "You shall not commit adultery" to mean, "... that every one who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart." (5:27-28) Matthew also faithfully records Jesus' familiarity with the role of women inside their homes. He alone records Jesus' parable, "The Kingdom of Heaven is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till it all leavened." (13:33) Jesus was conscious of women in his ministry as is attested to by the synoptic Gospels but only Luke emphasizes this redeeming awareness. Word usage is proof enough; Mark refers to women eight times, Matthew fourteen times, while Luke refers to them twenty-three times.

But this point of emphasis is not confined solely to the number of references to women. The intimate details of the women who surround Jesus also reveal Luke's special concern.

John uses the word 'women' twenty-one times, but thirteen of these references are confined to one incident; the Samaritan woman from Sychar who is engaged by Jesus in a discussion which leads to her conversion. (4:7-42) I feel this story is an authentic portrait of the man Jesus. The content of the conversation may be John's composition, but the setting is right, at least from Luke's point of view. Another four references are found in the redeeming incident of Jesus' relationship with a woman caught in adultery. (8:1-11) These two stories are among the most memorable of all the gospels and they centre on women.

Paul's concept of women is confined almost exclusively to his first letter to the Corinthians, Chapter 11 and if anyone does not agree with the tradition that Paul sets forth he says, "We recognize no other practice, nor do the churches of God." What are these practices and ideas? Firstly, the head of every man is Christ, the head of every woman is her husband and the head of Christ is God. She is sort of one step lower than man because God created first a man and from the man came a woman, although now that both are in the church, they are dependent upon each other so that now man is born of woman. That logic is about as neat as one could ever imagine. Secondly, the woman is to keep her head covered when praying

or else cut off her hair. Since it is disgraceful to see a shorn woman and since her hair is her pride, then she should cover her head when praying. Another neat argument. Men, of course, being in the image and glory of God do not need to cover their head, but woman ... why, they are the glory of man. This gives us men scriptural confidence for decking out our wives in new stylish clothes which we may need to turn to for comfort when the bank telephones. And remember, "If anyone is disposed to be contentious, we recognize no other practice, nor do the churches of God." (I Cor. 11:2-16) In church the women are to be silent. (I Cor. 14:34-35) Perhaps we can conclude by saying the church is to be a refuge in the midst of the world; a refuge from smoking and drinking and the chatter of women.

CONCLUSION

The attempt has been made to demonstrate that Luke set the Nazareth incident at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry because he thought it contained the motifs that he wished to develop: the universal note; the creative activity of the Holy Spirit; the sympathy for the poor, the sinner and women. Not only were these of special interest to Luke, but he interpreted these interests as springing from the life and thought of Jesus. It has also been pointed out that although these interests are especially emphasized in the Lucan material, they are not peculiar to the whole of the New Testament.

It now remains to indicate something of the relationship between chapter two and chapter three. Jesus was born and raised at a time in history when the resentment of the Jews towards the Romans was so intense that it was bound to lead to a ruinous war. His people were united not only by this common hatred, but by their common religion which, at many points, fanned their hatred. As God's chosen people, there was confidence that He certainly intended something better for them than servitude. Each sectarian movement had a solution to this impasse. The Essenees had withdrawn from the battlefield altogether and had gone off into seclusion.

The Sadducees counselled compromise and retention of the status-quo at all costs. The Pharisees' adherence to the Law and Traditions separated them from the life of the common people and encouraged them to wait patiently for divine intervention in the form of a heavenly Son of Man. The Zealots modelled their solution on the basis of armed revolution which caused them to look for a Davidic Messiah. Against this religious and political background, Jesus responded. Rejecting the direction of life taken by the Essenes, Jesus became involved in the life and times of his generation. Vitally concerned about the welfare of his fellow men, Jesus received an experience of God which guided his destiny. God was a loving, searching, forgiving Father and on the basis of this conception, He began to teach and preach and heal. Since God was the Father of all His children, human life was more important than rules about it. Jesus' association with the poor, the sinners and women and His disregard of ceremonial laws when human welfare was at stake, led Him into conflict with the Pharisees. His radical call to discipleship with its loving of enemies and its turning the other cheek, seemed to support the Sadducean doctrine of compromise. But as the discipleship stemmed from the prophetic insistence on the missionary vocation of Israel, publicly supported by a purge of the Court of the Gentiles, the Sadducees, who feared revolt, forced a trial sentence upon Him, ending His life in crucifixion. Even here, Jesus' experience of God held true -

"Father forgive them" - even here, the concern for His fellows was expressed - "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" - even here, the trust in God was exemplified - "Father into Thy hand I commit my spirit." Such a man was truly the Son of God.

Luke was called to face a different situation altogether. The first church at Jerusalem intended Christianity to be subject to the requirements of Judaism. When the Gospel was extended to Gentiles under Paul, the Jerusalem Church attempted restrictions, according to Acts, which led to an ensuing disagreement. Who was the Gospel for? Luke's experience on the mission field compelled him to demonstrate that the Gospel was for all; Jews first, including the poor, the outcaste and women; Samaritans second, and finally the whole world. This all sprang from the life and teaching of Jesus who was a true prophet of Israel, calling His nation to reconsider their missionary vocation under God.

The Christian Church was therefore the true Israel. Luke takes care to support this. Zacharias and Elizabeth "were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." (1:6) They had John circumcized on the eighth day. Jesus also was promptly circumcized according to the Law of Moses and taken to the Temple to be presented to the Lord, "as it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord, and to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord." (2:21-24) Simeon was

"righteous and devout" (2:25) Jesus was taken to the Temple, "that they might do concerning Him after the custom of the law." (2:28) Mary and Joseph left Jerusalem only after, "they had accomplished all things that were according to the law of the Lord" (2:39) and they returned "every year to Jerusalem at the feast of the passover." (2:41) Jesus begins His ministry teaching in the synagogues on the Sabbath, "as His custom was." (4:15-16) The centurion whose servant Jesus healed is commended to Jesus by the elders of the Jews who said, "He is worthy that thou shouldest do this for him; for he loveth our nation and himself built us our synagogue." (7:1-10) When Jesus heals the ten lepers, He sends them to the priests. Joseph of Arimathea was a good and righteous man. (23:50) The women who followed Jesus' body to the tomb, rested on the Sabbath, "according to the commandment." (23:56) The only conclusion we dare draw from this amount of material is that Christianity is certainly not anti-Jewish.

But, the Jews had stubbornly rejected God's message. "The Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him." (7:30) In fact, they hindered the Gospel, "Woe unto you lawyers for ye took away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." (11:52) We have noticed on another occasion, the opposition of the Pharisees and Scribes to Jesus because He "receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." (15:2) To Luke, the Pharisees "were lovers of

of money" and we know the content of this warning. In reflecting upon the fate of Jerusalem, Luke writes, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword and shall be led captive into all the nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." (21:24) To the men on the road to Emmaus, it was "the chief priests and our rulers" who "delivered Him up to be condemned to death and crucified Him." (24:20) Although the Church is not anti-Jewish, the Jews certainly rejected it so that now the church has entered into possession of all the privileges that had formerly been theirs as the people of God. This meant that Christianity was entitled to the protection of the Roman State.

It was not anti-Roman. Luke puts the birth of John "in the days of Herod, King of Judea" (1:5) and the birth of Jesus when "a decree from Caesar Augustus" went out "that all the world should be enrolled. This was the first enrollment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria." (2:1-2) Jesus' public ministry began "in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee and his brother Philip tetrarch of the region of Iturea and Trachonitis and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene." (3:1) Pilate could find "no fault in this man" (23:4) and Herod did not either. In fact, their relationship with Jesus made them friends, "for before they were at enmity between themselves." (23:11-12) Luke is so

insistent on this point that he has Pilate again say, "Ye brought unto me this man, as one that perverteth the people: and behold I, having examined him before you, found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him: no, nor yet Herod: for he sent him back unto us; and behold, nothing worthy of death hath been done by him." (23:14-15)

The penitent criminal on the cross says, "this man hath done nothing amis." (23:41) Luke changes the words of the centurion from "Truly this man was the Son of God" to read, "This was an innocent man." (23:49)

In the Book of Acts, this theme is further developed and there is the constant explanation that the Jews took the initiative. The Jews plotted trouble at Damascus, Ephesus, Corinth, Jerusalem and Caesarea. Even the Roman magistrates recognize that it was a Jewish controversy. Since the earlier authorities did not find Christianity subversive, then any persecutions are obviously in error.

The attempt has been made to see the Lucan matter within the context of the New Testament against the background of the first century. It is unlikely that all the Lucan material was selected solely because it agreed with Luke's special interests, although we have tried to demonstrate that much of his material was selected to support his putting the Nazareth account at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry. This was the program of the saving work of the Lord and Luke marshalled stories and parables to support this claim.

This consideration of the material peculiar to Luke's Gospel represents a beginning in the life-long attempt to more adequately understand the life of Jesus Christ as found in scripture. The material presents a portrait of Jesus which has been part of my own experience, and for this reason, the intensive study of it has proved rewarding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barrett, C. K., The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. MacMillan, 1947.
- Burkitt, F. C., The Gospel History and Its Transmission. T and T Clark, 1909.
- Cadbury, H. J., The Making of Luke-Acts. MacMillan, 1927.
- Carpenter, J. E., The First Three Gospels. British and Foreign Unitarian Association, 4th Edition, 1909.
- Creed, J. M., The Gospel According to St. Luke. MacMillan, 1930.
- Denny, W. B., The Career and Significance of Jesus. Nelson, 1933.
- Erdman, C. R., The Gospel of Luke. Westminster, 1921.
- Grant, F. C., The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth. Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Grant, F. C., The Growth of the Gospels. Abingdon, 1933.
- Hastings, James, Dictionary of the Bible. Scribners, 1909.
- Lietzmann, Hans, The Beginnings of the Christian Church. Nicholson and Watson, 1937.
- Lightfoot, R. H., History and Interpretation of the Gospels. Hodder and Stoughton, 1937.
- MacKinnon, James, From Christ to Constantine. Longmans, Green and Co., 1936.
- Manson, T. W., The Sayings of Jesus. S.C.M., 1949.
- Manson, T. W., The Teachings of Jesus. Cambridge, 2nd Edition, 1935.

- Moffatt, James, The First Five Centuries of the Church. Hodder and Stoughton, 1937.
- Montefiore, C. G., The Synoptic Gospels. Macmillan, 1927.
- Plumptre, E. R., The Gospel of St. Luke. Cassell, Petter, Galpin and Co., 1879
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. Macmillan, 4th Impression Revised, 1930.
- Taylor, Vincent, The Gospels. Epworth, 1930.
- Taylor, Vincent, The Gospels. Epworth, 8th Edition, 1956.
- Titus, Eric Lane, Essentials of New Testament Study. Ronald, 1958
- Torrey, C. C., The Translations Made From the Original Aramaic Gospels. Manchester University Press, 1945.
- The Interpreter's Bible, Abingdon, Volume 8, 1954.

B29821